

**THE MESSENGER**  
OF  
**THE CHURCHES:**

**MAGAZINE OF SCRIPTURE EXPOSITION, AND MEDIUM OF INTERCOMMUNICATION  
ON ALL SOCIAL AND PRACTICAL TOPICS OF IMPORTANCE  
[TO THE BROTHERHOOD.**

**WITH THE**

**CONGREGATIONAL INTELLIGENCE OF THE YEAR 1866.**

**VOL. II.**

**NEW SERIES.**

**EDINBURGH:**  
**PRINTED BY A. & W. R. WILSON, 56 HIGH STREET.**

**MDCCLXVI.**

# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE.
The Condemned Hierarchy <i>Luke 16</i>	1
Messiah's Mercy to the Poor	8
The Little Horn: The Antichrist	11, 26
Miracles	57
Duration	67
Satan	88
The Ten Kings and the One King	135
The Man of Sin	166, 180
Spiritualising	17
An English Reply to the Rochester Epistle	20
The Gospel Preached to Jew and Gentile	22
Jesus Christ and Him Crucified	33, 71
Friendly Greetings across the Sea	37
What is Literalism	40
Translations of the Seventy Weeks or Heptades Prophecy	46
A Word of Criticism	47
The Inquirer	47, 80, 144
The Importance of the Historical Books of the Old Testament in relation to Prophecy	49
The Unwritten Rubric	53
The Gospel of the Kingdom of God	55, 77
The Proximity of the Kingdom	57, 87
Letter from Birmingham	61
Calvary and Zion	65
The Witch of Endor	73, 82
Persistence of Old Bible Names	76
The Power of God in His Word	79
Let Brotherly Love Continue	81
Is the Proximity of the Kingdom, the "Gospel" preached by Jesus?	92
Sacred Criticism	93
The Lord's Prophecy	97
The Personality of Satan	99
What is the True Age of the World	104
Familiar Spirits	107
Mello	111
The Annual Meeting, 1866	113
Wherewithal shall we be Clothed	129
Shahvoog; the Hebrew word translated "Week" in Dan. ix.	131
Jesus Washing the Disciples' Feet	132
The Working Man	142
Remarks on the Genuineness of Revelation xx. 5..	145

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
The Doctrine of Life . . . . .	147
Reconnoitring an Eneiny's Fortress . . . . .	148
The Inspiration of the Scriptures . . . . .	152
Spirits of Antichrist . . . . .	153, 177
That Blessed Hope . . . . .	157
A Church's Testimony to the Word of the Truth of the Gospel . . . . .	161
Things most surely Believed . . . . .	172
Intelligence—	
Aberdeen . . . . .	143
Barrow in Furness . . . . .	31, 95
Birmingham . . . . .	188
Brooklyn, U.S. . . . .	95
Buchan . . . . .	128
Crossgates . . . . .	47, 63, 79
Dundee . . . . .	95, 187
Edinburgh . . . . .	47, 63, 79, 95, 174, 188
Glasgow . . . . .	80, 95, 112, 143
Halifax, N.S. . . . .	95, 160
Huddersfield . . . . .	128, 159
Innerleithen . . . . .	15
Jarrow-on-Tyne . . . . .	48
Kirkcaldy . . . . .	48
Lanarkshire . . . . .	176, 188
Liverpool . . . . .	95
Mumbles . . . . .	15, 31, 48, 64, 174
Newcastle on-Tyne . . . . .	176
Nottingham . . . . .	160
Sheffield . . . . .	143
Swansea . . . . .	31
Tranent . . . . .	64
Turriff . . . . .	16, 32, 64, 96
United States . . . . .	111
<i>Hymn for the Evening</i> . . . . .	31
<i>A Proverb</i> . . . . .	53
<i>All is Vanity</i> . . . . .	62
<i>The Holy Land</i> . . . . .	141
<i>Invocatory Hymn</i> . . . . .	159
<i>All things for Good,</i> . . . . .	187

# THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES.

"I SPEAK AS TO WISE MEN, JUDGE YE WHAT I SAY."

No. 1.

JANUARY 1, 1866.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II.

## THE CONDEMNED HIERARCHY.

*Elucidation Class Notes on Luke xvi. enlarged.*

THIS chapter (verses 19-31), is the grand resort of all persons who attempt a defence of the unscriptural idea of the immortality of the soul. Our object then must be to see what is the true teaching of this portion of Scripture, and thus obtain the best answer to the suppositious meaning fastened upon it.

We have however to meet two classes of reasoners: those who affirm, and those who deny, its parabolic structure.

The latter is the more illogical, relying almost solely upon the absence of the preface of comparison "the kingdom is like to." This is but a feeble reason, because seeing that it is not the kingdom which is in consideration it is unnecessary. But it is alleged that the words "there was," stamp it as a fact, or real history. This cannot be granted, for the same mode of expression occurs in ver. 1, in chaps. xv. 11, xiv. 16, all of which are accepted as parables. Then, the style of the words is evidently parabolic, and especially the appended *moral*. But the evangelist's words settle the question: "All these things spake Jesus

to them in parables, and *without a parable spake he not to the people,*" Matt. xiii. 34.

The other reasoners, whilst having truth in admitting its parabolic structure, are quite as wide of the word by deducing an untrue and unintended lesson from the parable—*i.e.*, the existence of a separate soul. To such we would commend Dr Trench's remarks, who writing of these fictitious narratives lays down this law thereupon: "*They may not be made first sources of doctrine.* When a doctrine is *settled by plain texts*, they may illustrate it. But controversialists, to sustain some *weak* position, often forget this rule; and looking round for arguments, invent for themselves supports in these." Till the believers in the immortality of separate souls have found the plain texts they must not use the parable. And knowing that such plain texts cannot be found we may proceed to investigate the nature and teaching of this supposed case, upon its own merits.

Before doing so we must, however, take note of the direct scripture testimony, which utterly negating

the popular ideas of the nature of man and his state in death, leave no foothold for the ordinary understanding of this parable. We shall do this from the parable as a basis.

1. It is said that the subjects, both the poor and the rich man *died*. Now death is to cease to exist (Gen. iii. 19, vi. 17, vii. 21-23; Ecc. iii. 19, 20). Life and its antithesis death are spoken of in terms the very opposite of immortal soulism (Job xiv. 12, viii. 9, x. 19, 20, xiii. 28, iv. 19, vii. 6; 1 Pet. i. 24). With life perish its results; *e.g.*, action, thought, speech, &c., so that of them it is said,—“they know not anything, . . . their love, their hatred, their envy, is now perished,” Ecc. ix. 4-6. “His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day *his thoughts perish*,” Ps. cxlvi. 4.

2. The rich man was in *hades*, *i.e.*, in the grave; concerning which it is said, “there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave,” Ecc. ix. 10. “In death is no remembrance of Thee; in the grave, who shall give Thee thanks?” Ps. vi. 5; Is. xxxviii. 18, 19.

3. Lazarus was in Abraham’s bosom. Now, as Abraham was dead and buried (Gen. xxv. 8, 10, xv. 15; Zeeh. i. 5; Luke xx. 37, 38), it follows, that for Lazarus to lie in his bosom, he must find it in the grave.

4. Hell, as the place of punishment, is not yet in existence. This (in the New Testament, *Gehenna*, not *hades*) is always represented as future. The punishment of *Gehenna* is everlasting *destruction*, 2 Thes. i. 9; for there the wicked will be *burnt up, consumed into smoke*, Ps. xxxvii. 20, so as to “*be no more*,” Ps. civ. 35; become *ashes* under the feet of the righteous, &c., Mal. iv. 1-3. So that it is impossible for the parable to teach ordinary notions of hell-fire

whilst the subject is in “the cold damp grave.”

If, then, the uniform teaching of scripture is against the popular ideas, we may be sure this parable will not prove them. And so, having demonstrated the negative, we may proceed to consider the affirmative teaching of the fiction.

The first inquiry should be,—Whose is the parable? Scholars have doubted our Lord’s authorship, and indeed not without reason, seeing it is not at all of his characteristic utterances. M’Culloch says,—“Neither is it directly said that our Saviour did use the parable, but it is abruptly introduced. I am unable to learn whether a similar parable has been recognised in the rabbinical writings, but the complexion of it certainly accords with their mode of illustration much better than it does with that of our Saviour.” Doddridge goes further, and affirms that “Dr Lightfoot and others have shown that the Jews in their *Gemera* have a parable much to the same purpose.” And in *Josephus* we have what we think ample confirmatory testimony. It will not be mis-spent labour to give an abstract of his *Dissertation on Hades*, both because it shows us the original of the popular teaching, and because of its bearing on this parable.

“Hades, wherein the souls of the righteous and unrighteous are detained, a *subterraneous* region, in perpetual *darkness*, a place of *custody* for souls, in which *angels* are guardians, who distribute to them *temporary punishments*. In this region is a *lake of unquenchable fire*, whereinto we suppose *no one hath hitherto been cast*; but is prepared for a day afore-determined by God, when the unjust shall be adjudged to this *everlasting punishment*, while the just shall obtain an *incorruptible* and

never-fading kingdom. There is one descent into this region, at whose *gate* we believe there stands an archangel with a host; which gate when those pass through who are conducted by the angels, they do not go the same way; but the just are guided to the *right-hand*, to a region of *light*, in which the just have dwelt since the beginning of the world; not constrained by necessity, but ever enjoying the prospect of the good things they see, and esteeming those things beyond what we have here; with whom there is no place of toil, no burning heat, no piercing cold, nor are any briars there; but the countenance of the fathers and of the just, while they wait for that rest and *eternal new life in heaven* which is to succeed this region,—this place we call ABRAHAM'S BOSOM. The unjust are dragged by force to the *left-hand* by the angels allotted for punishment, no longer going with goodwill, but as prisoners driven by violence. Now those angels drag them into the neighbourhood of hell itself, and they do not stand clear of the *hot vapour* itself; but when they have a nearer view of this spectacle, as of a terrible and great prospect of fire, they are struck with a fearful expectation of a future judgment, and in effect punished thereby; and where they see the place of the fathers and of the just, even hereby are they punished also; for a *chaos* deep and large is fixed between them, insomuch that a just man who hath compassion on them cannot be admitted, nor can one who is unjust, if he were bold enough to attempt it, pass over it."

This abstract, but more especially the complete dissertation, presents such a tissue of confusions, childishnesses, bathos, and perverted scripture, as to stamp it at once with the impress of foolishness. And by con-

sequence, as an exposition of the original vain philosophy, out of which sprang purgatory, the wild, God-dishonouring fancies of eternal torments, shown in the writings of such men as Jonathan Edwards; and also of the more modern notion of Hades, as the ante-judgment prison (or intermediate state) of the naked souls. To suppose that He of whom it is testified, "he taught them not as the scribes" and Pharisees, should endorse the foolishness of their heathen notions, is a libel upon him who "spoke as never man spake."

We think there can be no doubt that it was such teachings as this which Jesus condemned, and warned his disciples against, Matt. xvi. 6, 12. Doubtless some will object that as Josephus was not a Pharisee, we are wrong in concluding this to be an exposition of their ideas on the subject. True, Josephus was politically not a Pharisee; but as to doctrines, he differed little. His objection to them was much such a difference as that betwixt Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism, or Puseyism and Popery. That they held the views as shewn in his dissertation is, we think, amply shewn by other mentions of them in his works. "They believe that souls have an *immortal vigour* in them, and that *under the earth* there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but that the former shall have power to revive and live again; *on account of which doctrines*, they are able greatly to persuade the body of the people," Antiq. III. xviii. 3. "They say that all souls are incorruptible; but that the souls of good men are only removed into other bodies,—but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment," (Wars. II., ch.

viii. 14.) Such remarks as these evidently are of the nature of a Presbyterian's upon the Calvinistic teachings of the English Prayer-book, *i.e.* sympathetic. When Josephus condemns the Pharisees, it is where their political rivalry comes into play, like that of the Scotch *versus* English established churches.

A few quotations will show how directly antagonistic to our Lord's own teachings these Pharisaic notions were. The kingdom of heaven, a yet future state, is the only hope he held out, Matt. v. 3-10, 19, 20. "Except your righteousness exceed that of the scribes and pharisees, you shall in no case enter the kingdom of heaven, (Comp. with Luke xvi. 15; Matt. vi. 33, 10, vii. 21, 22.) Life was also a thing to be *sought for* (not possessed, as it would be had men immortal souls), Matt. vii. 14; John iv. 14, 36, vi. 53, 57, viii. 51, 12. It was to be a future reward and bestowment, secured by present faith and good works, Matt. xix. 29, xxv. 46; John iii. 15, 36, v. 24, 39, 40, x. 10, vi. 27. It was only to be enjoyed through resurrection, John v. 25-29, vi. 39, 40, xi. 25, 26, xiv. 19; Matt. xix. 28. If the doctrine of the immortality of the soul be true, then the apostles are "found false witnesses of God," for they proclaimed Christ as having "brought life and incorruptibility to light through the gospel;" which could not be if it was known before by philosophy (as the soul-doctrine was), and especially if Jesus said nothing of the immortality of the soul in his gosselling.

From the preceding we conclude:

1. That the ideas ordinarily deduced from the parable, in so far as they imply a future state, are Pharisaic.

2. That similar parables are to be found in Jewish rabbinical tradi-

tional works, and as such are condemned by Jesus, Matt. xv. 3, 6, 9.

3. That they are in direct opposition to our Lord's own teaching concerning immortality.

But do you then deny the authenticity of the parable, or that our Lord used it? it will be asked. No, far from it. But we are driven to this point, that it is a Pharisaic doctrine which he makes use of with which to point his rebuke to them. It is an acknowledged truth, that to crush an opponent with *his own* arguments is the greatest victory. It is to slay Goliath with his own sword. And this parable appears to be a carrying out of the invincible logic, "*out of thine own mouth will I condemn thee, thou wicked servant.*"

Whether Jesus took some already made and standard parable (as is quite probable), to which he affixed the moral of verses 30 and 31; or constructed it upon the basis of their teachings, just as we might upon the popular notions of the state of the dead, or as we might condemn a papist by a supposed case of purgatory, — cannot be decided. But neither way affects the value of its use in argument. And neither commits him to a recognition of, or sympathy with, the quoted notions. In his mouth, and as he used it, it became somewhat like the voices from the grave of Ez. xxxii. 21; Is. xiv. 9-11; Rev. vi. 9-11. It was as fraught with a great moral and prophetic lesson as though it were of the purest doctrine. Let us then proceed to an analysis of the parable.

Its antecedent context begins at verse 14 (where the paragraph sign ¶ should stand, instead of at verse 13, which is a pendant to the preceding lesson.)

"The pharisees, who were covetous, ridiculed him," and so brought down on themselves his rebuke.

"Ye are they who justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts; for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." It is this truth which the parable illustrates. They are shown from their own teachings how valueless their ostentatious piety (Matt. vi. 1-7; Luke xviii. 9-14, &c.) was in the eye of God. The fiction used also shewed a future retribution, when the disturbed balance of equity would be righted, and those who had enjoyed God's good gifts (ver. 25) without making a right use of them would not inhabit everlasting mansions, (ver. 9-12, 21. They were relying upon the fact of their fleshly sonship to Abraham: the parable shews them what John had before denounced to them (Matt. iii. 9,) that inheritance of the promises made to Abraham involved the manifestation of a character like Abraham's; and that wanting this, Abraham would reject them as reprobates (ver. 25.)

"The law and the prophets (were yours) till John, since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." This is the historic fact, the bearing of which upon the parable viewed prophetically, is important. They had the ecclesiastical, and much of the civil power in their own hands. We need only refer to such mentions of them as in John xi. 46, 47, 57, for proof of this. Our Lord's affirmation, Matt. xxiii. 2, 3, "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat" speaks the same thing. Josephus here again affords us valuable corroborative testimony.

"The Pharisees, on account of their doctrines are able greatly to persuade the body of the people, and whatsoever they do about *divine worship, prayers, and sacrifices*, they perform them according to their

direction," (Antiq. Book III, chap. xviii. 3). "Alexandra . . . put all things into their power." "Hyrcanus, the high priest, permitted the Pharisees to do everything; to whom Alexandra ordered the multitude to be obedient . . . She had indeed the name of regent, but the Pharisees had the authority; for it was they who restored such as had been banished, and set at liberty such as were prisoners, and, to say all at once, *they differed in nothing from lords*," (Antiq. XIII., xvi. 1, 2; see also Wars I., v. 2). "There was a certain sect of men who were Jews, who valued themselves highly upon the exact skill they had in the law of their fathers, and made men believe they were highly favoured of God, by whom this set of women were inveigled . . . These are those who are called the sect of the Pharisees, who were in a capacity of greatly opposing kings. A cunning sect they were, and soon elevated to a pitch of open fighting and mischief," (XVII., ii. 4).

If we substitute for "Pharisees," the words "papal priests," "ecclesiastics," or "monks," we get a picture of a more modern phase of the same ecclesiastical usurpation. And this will help us better to understand the co-temporary politics of our Lord's time. If for "John the immerser," we substitute "Luther," then we have an almost perfect parallel afforded us, and are enabled to read the two reformations in mutual light. For what the Romish priesthood was in Luther's time, the sect of the Pharisees was in John's days.

But a change took place: not in the characters of either, but in their political status. By the reformers' preaching, a great unshackling of the popular mind was effected. By John's and Jesus' gosselling, "every man pressed into the kingdom," no



longer blindly and ignorantly doing the behest of the Pharisees. That this grand popular movement (Luke i. 76-79; Mark i. 5), gave rise to strife (Matt. xi. 12), that it was transient, no more affects the fact or the testimony of its being a reformation, than did the restoration of the papal religion in Saxony, the reality of Luther's efforts.

We have quoted and argued thus lengthily as a necessary premise to identifying the subjects of the parable, which we purpose to view in its prophetic aspect. For that it was a prophecy we think there is no doubt: and that our Lord, out of such unpromising materials as Pharisæic notions, should construct a moral and prophetic parable, stamps him as one of the most notable disputants the world has ever seen. Micaiah's prophecy, 1 Kings xxii., is perhaps one of the nearest examples, but infinitely far beneath our Lord's.

We have thus far identified the rich man, "clothed in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day," as the ecclesiastico—civil Pharisees, they being the sacerdotal lords. Who then was Lazarus? Obviously, that party in direct opposition and circumstances; those of the contextual *all men*, who having pressed into (or towards) the kingdom persevered still in their reformatory course. This party would be found in Jesus and his disciples, most of whom were of the crowd, the common sort (Mark xii. 37). These the Pharisees, from their pinnacle of *gnosis* or *exact knowledge*, utterly despised, and accounted as worthless scum (John vii. 45-49), but it was out of their midst that Jesus choose his consorts. The fact that he and his companions practically subsisted on alms, identifies them with the Lazarus class, as do

also the terms in which they speak of themselves (Matt. xix. 27, 29), and are addressed by their master (Matt. x. 9, 10, 38). Mary's prophecy (Luke i. 51-53), and Hannah's (1 Sam. ii. 7, 8), still further contribute to identify the subjects. Jesus and his followers may then aptly be understood as corresponding to the beggar, whose sores were licked by the dogs. The whole class of which they were representatives, were full of the sores of civil grievances, sores irritated by the licking of Gentile dogs, such as Herod, Pilate, &c.\* But Jesus and his disciples were pre-eminently thus conditioned, being subjects of the Gentile persecutions instigated by the Pharisee class.

It is noticeable that the death of both is well nigh coetaneous. But their fate is different. To see the point of this we must remember the circumstances attending the political death of the Jewish nation. The believers were almost exempt from the *sufferings* at the captivity of Jerusalem, they having had warning and fled from the city in time. Though they politically died, in ceasing to be connected with a body politic, yet their dispersion was comparatively a comforting, for their hunger, thirst, and sickness, were in Jewry. Out in the world among their fellow believers of the Gentiles, they would as it were be reclining

\* It is sufficient to quote Matt. xv. 26, 27, in support of the well known estimation in which the Jews held the Gentiles, and to identify the class named "the dogs." But it will be objected that there is an error in accounting the licking as irritation, it being usually accounted as pity. We believe that it is true that the licking of a sore by a house dog will benefit the wound. But it is very doubtful if such would be the case with the prowling scavenging dogs of the East, whose saliva would be more likely to poison the wound as a swine's would. Yet even supposing this incorrect, it does not alter the chief fact that the dogs were Gentiles, for Pilate, who crucified Christ, had more pity than the Pharisees, and would have let him go. (Matt. xxvii. 19, 20, 24; Luke xxiii. 4, 14-23. See also Acts xviii. 12-17, &c.)

in the bosom of Abraham. For the gladness of the gospel, the hope of life, was that the *blessing of Abraham* should come on the Gentiles through faith; that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the *household of faith*.

The Pharisees died and were buried, ceasing, like the others, their living relationship to the nation. Their sacerdotalism, virtually, if not really, ceased before the captivity—the ecclesiastical body being in a state of decomposition during the internecine feuds which raged. So that there was a truth and reality in the metaphor of their buried body suffering the fiery tortures of the siege. At this time there could be no communications betwixt the two classes. The *poor in faith* were then afar off; and even if their pity had moved them to help, they could not have passed to the sufferers in their hades of Jerusalem. The Roman armies interposed, an impassable barrier, to complement the yawning, unbridgeable gulf of the unpardonable sin those had committed in murdering the Prince of life, and not repenting. The answer put into the mouth of Abraham is equivalent to Paul's statement when speaking of much the same class, 2 Th. i. 5-10.

The request for Lazarus to be sent to this rich man's house still further identifies the sacerdotal hierarchy of which we have spoken. He had *five* brethren. Now there were just five sects or classes who shared with the Pharisees in the ecclesiastical and magisterial honours and emoluments. These were—

1. Scribes.
2. Lawyers or elders.
3. Herodians.
4. Sadducees.
5. Essenes.

All these,\* more or less, sprung up like the Pharisees out of the seed of Babylonian false notions and practices. With these they defiled their father Abraham's house.

Abraham acknowledges the sonship whilst casting him off. This and his second answer still more proves that the application must be found in, and confined to Jewry, because "they have Moses and the prophets." This was not true of the Gentiles, nor yet of the common people of the Jews, who could no more be said to have had those writings than the laity could be said to have had the Bible during Papal domination.

The untruth of the notion, that "if one went from the dead they would reform," was shown by their unbelief of the writings. If the lessons of Abraham's life, if such laws as were given with all the accompaniments of the divine presence, proclaiming "thou shalt love the Lord with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself"—if the continual warnings of the prophets did not arouse them to their duty, vain would be the voice of one sent to them from the dead. Even when the Lord spoke, there had been a proof of this. He had raised a Lazarus from the dead, and by this act supplied the greatest plea for reformation and faith in him. What response did they give? They sought to kill both him and Lazarus. And when they had murdered the heir, and he had risen from the dead, they tried to enact a lie, by suborning the watch to say, "His disciples came and stole him away while we slept." And when he sent his messengers with the voice of the risen Saviour, "they would not be persuaded."

\* Corresponding to the Papal sects or orders of Jesuits, B. neditines, Franciscans, Dominicans, &c., &c.

Hence they were left to suffer torment in the flame of "the siege and straitness:" a torment which their dupes and allies may be said to suffer in measure even yet, (Matt. xxvii. 25.)

We learn then that this parable is a prophecy of the fate of the pharisaic sect in particular (and of

their brother sacerdotals in general), founded upon their teachings. But whilst it is a prophecy, it is also a moral rebuke and condemnation, being in this respect made like to our Lord's *own* illustrative cases. For most of his parables have a doctrinal lesson conveyed through a prophetic medium. J. W.

### MESSIAH'S MERCY TO THE POOR.

"And the poor have the gospel preached unto them," Matth. xi. 2-6

JESUS is that Christ the Son of God who should come into the world. In vain do the Jews look for another. And their doing so is worse than vain. It prepares them for receiving the wrong man, this rejection of the right one. I am come unto you in my Father's name and you receive me not; when another cometh unto you in his own name him you will receive. In our common version it is, "if another," &c. But the same Greek word is translated in 1 John iii. 3, "*When* he shall appear," &c.

It was written in the ancient prophets that Christ when he came should heal the bodily maladies of men. In his days the lame man was to leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb to sing. Well, Jesus healed all their diseases, thus showing he was the Messiah. "Surely he hath carried our griefs, and borne our sorrows," as saith Esaias the prophet.

Also, according to the ancient scriptures, Messiah was to preach the gospel to the poor, or meek, who are generally the poor. Thus, Is. lxi. 1, says, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach glad tidings to the meek; he hath sent me to bind up

the broken-hearted. And so Jesus did preach the gospel to the poor meek ones of the earth, and so proved that he was Messiah. The common people heard him gladly. The poor among men rejoiced in the Holy One of Israel. They found his words to be words of life most admirably adapted to their case; and so believed on him. As, for instance, the poor fishermen of Galilee. And Jesus said to the twelve, Will ye also go away? And Peter said, Lord to whom can we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe, and are sure, that thou art that Christ, the Son of God.

In the ancient writings it is also testified that the Messiah should be to many a stone of stumbling, and rock of offence. And so many were offended in Jesus. But blessed is every one who trusteth in him, as anointed and born of God, to be his king on his holy hill of Zion.

Many of the Jews were offended in him, because he did not at that time fulfil all that is written of the Messiah. Some might say, surely this Jesus is the Christ. When the Christ cometh shall he do more works (greater or better), than this man doeth? But others might say (for they had great reasonings among

themselves), "Yes, the Messiah will do more works than this man doeth. The Messiah is the Son of man who will come in the clouds of heaven, and save Israel out of all the lands and hands of our enemies; he will plant us in the land that God gave to our fathers to dwell in; he will make us the head of the heathen; and he will reign over us on Mount Zion, from thenceforth even forever. Let this Jesus of Nazareth show us the sign from heaven, and we will believe on him. Remember that the false Messiah comes before the true one. That the coming of the false one is with all power and signs, and lying wondrous, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness. Does not this Jesus cast out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils?" So might they reason among themselves.

And so might John reason in himself, "I hear that Jesus whom I baptized, does many miracles such as the Messiah should do. I hear he preaches the gospel to the poor, healing the broken hearted. But this is not all that the Messiah should do. He should open the prison doors to them that are bound. In the very same scripture, where it is written that he should preach the gospel to the poor, it is written he should set free the prisoners. Why does Jesus not set me free if he be the Christ. If thou be the Christ save thyself and us."

Ah! John, patience, patience. Jerusalem is not all saved in one day. How poor is he who has not patience. Let patience have its perfect work, that you may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing. The time is coming when Jesus will fulfil all that is written of the Messiah. The day is at hand when he will come in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. Then he will do all that you and the Jews

look for at the hands of the Messiah. But the end is not yet. It will come however. Though it tarry, wait for it. And then you will see this Son of God completely, and forever destroy all the works of the devil. Then there will be a world without sin, and without disease, and without poverty, and without ignorance, and without a grave. But, in the meantime, we, you his forerunner, the Messiah himself, and all we his disciples must enter into that glorious state of things through much tribulation.

Blind, lame, leprous, deaf, dead, poor, ignorant, doubting, damned. O, what a sad, sad, catalogue of human woes. Sair, alas! and sad, and many are the ills poor mortals share. But, blessed be God, our Saviour is more than equal to our sorrows. Our help is laid upon one who is mighty. He will save us, save us from all our sins, and from all our sorrows. He is infinitely able, and infinitely willing. Come unto me, all ye who labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. No matter what your burden is. Come to me, and I will give you rest. Him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out. Other physicians may refuse cases for want of fees, or because beyond their skill; but I refuse no case on any ground. Come to me. I will heal you. Sight was Messiah's mercy to the blind, strength to the lame, cleansing to the leper, hearing to the deaf, life to the dead, and what to the poor? Wealth? No. Riches are not always a blessing; they are more frequently a curse. Riches harden the heart, blind the mind, and drown men's souls in perdition. They are strong to do this through the weakness of the flesh. So that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to

enter into the kingdom of God. How hardly shall they that have riches be saved? For—

Alas! how oft in haughty mood  
 God's creatures they express;  
 Or else, neglecting a' that's gude,  
 They riot in excess;  
 Baith careless and fearless  
 O' either heaven or hell,  
 Esteeming and deeming  
 It a' an idle tale.

And so wealth was not Messiah's mercy to the poor. He knew well that, in the most of cases, the cure would be worse than the disease. Jesus was more inclined to make rich men poor, than poor men rich *in this world*.

He preached the gospel to them. That was Messiah's mercy to the poor. The poor need mercy. Poverty is a real evil. As much so is blindness. Yes, extreme poverty often quenches the fear of death. The poor man was therefore led to look for mercy from the Messiah, as well as the blind. And this is the mercy he gives them, the hopes and comforts of the gospel.

In the synagogue of Nazareth, Jesus read, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor. He refers to what was written of him in Isa. lxi. 1. But in Isaiah it is not poor but meek. However, it comes, generally speaking, to the same thing. In general, the poor are the meek. Now then this is how Messiah preached the gospel to the poor. "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." The rich and the proud have it now. The poor meek ones shall have it hereafter. The rich have it, but for a time, for a time how short. The meek shall have it forever. Is not that consolation for the poor? Is it not mercy to make known this to them?

The more you look into the gospel,

the more you see how rich it is as mercy to the poor. How well calculated its precious promises are to enable them to bear up under the ills of this world to which they are exposed, as poor men in hopes of the world to come. O, what a sad fate would be that of the poor, if they had not the hope of a better world.

The poor afflicted, honest man  
 Had never sure been born  
 Had there not been some recompense  
 To comfort those that mourn,

in another state and world to come. That there is such a recompense is made certain in the gospel, as preached by Jesus Christ.

Sometimes the poor are afflicted with hunger and nakedness. They have no bread to eat, and their looped and windowed raggedness exposes them to the cold blasts of winter, and the scorching summer suns. With what joy may these read what is written. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more—neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.

The rich have many friends, but the poor are despised by their neighbours. The poor are often galled by the contempt of both rich and poor.

I want less, I tent less,  
 Their roomy fire-side,  
 But hanker, and canker,  
 To see their scornfu' pride.

But here again the gospel comes in with its glorious consolations to the poor. Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth. Or, as Greek scholars read it, over the earth. Yes, wait a little. The rich

shall be poor, and the poor rich. Wait on the Lord, and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the earth, when the wicked are cut off, thou shalt see it. "And the daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift. Yes, the rich among the people (of Israel?) shall entreat thy favour," to speak for them to the Great King, thy husband. What a change. God doeth great things truly. And will soon do them too.

And that is another gospel, consolation to the poor, as the gospel was preached by Jesus and his apostles. The kingdom of God is at hand. He that turneth the world upside down, and maketh all things new, is at hand. Yet a little while, and he who shall come will come, and will not tarry. Bear up awhile, ye virtuous and believing poor.

It is a great mercy to the poor that the salvation of the gospel is free, gratis. He was a poor man, indeed, who had not a turtle-dove or two young pigeons; but under the gospel, remission of sins and eternal life do not cost one sparrow. Of course, I speak of the gospel as preached by the Lord and his apostles and John. Ho, every one that thirsteth, &c.

Those who believe and obey the gospel have not only the promise of the life to come, but also of the life

that now is. Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you. What mercy to the poor! He that trusteth in the Lord shall not want any good.

Let the poor then embrace their mercy. Let us not sin against our mercy. Let us believe and obey, and so enjoy the rich mercy of the gospel.

The gospel is preached to the rich as well as to the poor. Yes, and the rich have as much need of it as the poor. If the poor need it to save them under the ills of poverty, the rich need it to save them from the great evils of riches. And the gospel is free to all alike, whether rich or poor. Let the rich in wealth of gold and silver only be poor in spirit, and their's is the kingdom of heaven also.

Is the gospel Messiah's mercy to the poor? Then let no one despise or oppress them. Their Redeemer is mighty. Harken, my beloved brethren, hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom, which he hath promised to them that love him.

How can you visit and associate with such a poor woman? said a young foolish gentleman to his wiser sisters. Ah, brother, said they, this is the daughter of a great king.

D. L.

## THE LITTLE HORN.

### THE ANTICHRIST.

In one of the discourses delivered by the Lord to his *disciples* on the Mount of Olives, to be found in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew, reference is made by him to the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel. Direction being given to the *disciples in Judea* to flee to the mountains, when they see the abomination standing in the *holy place*. This is a conclusive proof that the prophecy, to which

reference is made, was not fulfilled *previous* to our Lord's first coming. In the making of this reference, the reader is specially directed to understand, or to think, concerning this statement. It is therefore to the passage in Daniel, with its context, that we must turn our attention.

It may be observed that this allusion is made by the Lord to Jewish disciples, in answer to several questions which they had propounded to him. The passage in Daniel also was written for Jews, concerning Jews, and the prophecy it contains, delivered to a Jew. Consequently it is in the light of Jewish history that we have to ask: Has it been fulfilled *since* the delivery of this discourse of the Lord? If so, when? If not, what are the statements of Daniel which demand our consideration?

It is in "the latter days that the prophecy is to be fulfilled," for (Dan. x. 14) it says, "I am come to make thee know what shall befall *thy people in the latter days.*" It may be gathered from other parts of scripture that the phrase, the latter days, has always reference to the period elapsing between the first and second coming of Christ. It is therefore in this period the prophecy will be fulfilled.

The abomination of the desolation is to stand in *the holy place*, and when *seen there*, they who are in Judea are to flee to the mountains. There can be no two opinions as to where the holy place was situated—in the temple itself. The Septuagint reads, "In *the temple* shall be the abomination of desolation." Has any abomination of desolation stood in the holy place *since* the ascension of the Lord? No, for no abomination was placed in the temple prior to its destruction by the Romans. The temple was burnt down, so that

none could be placed in it. Neither was it possible for any of *the disciples* to have *seen* any abomination under these circumstances. Prior to the final investment of Jerusalem by Titus, *they* had fled to Pella, a city beyond the Jordan, and *not* to the mountains. This Pella was one of the ten cities of Decapolis. Eusebius and Epiphanius both state that *the disciples* were warned beforehand of God to depart from the doomed city, and go to Pella, which warning was obeyed.

Without entering further into a consideration of the items of the context in Matthew, let us notice in whose time, it is said by Daniel, the abomination that maketh desolate is to be placed. The further consideration as to what constitutes the abomination, &c., is reserved for a future article.

The passage in Daniel has reference to the doings of a king, termed "a vile person," (Dan. xi. 21), and also "the king," who "shall do according to his will" (v. 36.) It is to the features characteristic of this king that we desire to direct the attention of the scripture reader and searcher. Many expositors of scripture teach that the abomination was set up by a vile person *before* the coming of Christ. But it is to be noticed in such expositions that the portion of the prophecy contained in the twenty-first verse is applied to *two* kings, whereas it is clear that "the vile person, to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom," is also the same of whom it is said, "*but he* shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries." Still more unanswerable is the statement of *the Lord himself*, that "*when ye*" (the disciples) "shall *see* the abomination of desolation," they are to flee to the mountains. This, too, being said

some *two hundred years* after the time when these expositors say it was fulfilled.

May be it will be as well to notice in proceeding the intimate relation which the visions and prophecies of Daniel have to each other. The vision of the image (ch. ii.) gives as a conclusion the setting up of a kingdom by the God of heaven "in the days of these kings." The vision of the four beasts (ch. vii.) concludes with the uprising of ten kings, three of whom are afterwards uprooted by one king, but all meeting with destruction, by means of a kingdom set up in their days, by one like the Son of man, and the people of the saints of the Most High. The vision of the ram and he-goat (ch. viii.) concludes with the uprising of a king, who is destroyed by the Prince of princes. In the prophecy of the seventy heptades (ch. ix.) that determined is to be poured upon the desolator. In the prophecy concerning the king, "who shall do according to his will" (ch. xi.) "he shall come to his end, and none shall help him." The coincidences are not only remarkable, but, as we believe, intentional, in these various passages, as we may hereafter see.

In the ninth chapter of Daniel, after the prayer of Daniel for Israel and Jerusalem, it says (21st ver.) "while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning," informed me, and (23d ver.) said, "I am to shew thee, for thou art greatly beloved, therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision."

Then follows the prophecy known as the prophecy of "the seventy weeks." The Septuagint translates the Hebrew of this phrase, as "seventy weeks of years." Other

Hebrewscholars translate it "seventy heptades." The context shews the sense in which the phrase is to be understood. Daniel had just seen that *seventy years* of desolation, as testified by Jeremiah, were fulfilled on Jerusalem; and has given, after his prayer, a prophecy relating to *seventy heptades of years*, upon thy people, and upon thy holy city.

These seventy heptades are divided into three parts, seven, sixty-two, and one. The conclusion of the *seventy heptades* is to be remarkable for the events then to transpire. To finish the transgression—to make an end of sins—to make reconciliation for iniquity—to bring in everlasting righteousness—to seal up the vision and the prophecy—and to anoint the most holy.

We now ask, at what period does the *history of the Jews* testify that these prophetic statements were fulfilled? Has their transgression ceased? Are their sins ended? When were they reconciled to God? When was everlasting righteousness brought into existence in connection with them? Has all prophecy been fulfilled? or sealed up? When was the Most Holy acknowledged by the Jews as their anointed? History does not answer any of these questions. The present dispersion and antagonistic position of the Jews is proof beyond dispute, that this portion of the prophecy *has not yet been fulfilled*.

It is generally admitted that the first seven heptades were literally fulfilled; and that the Messiah, the prince, did not appear till after the expiration of the sixty-nine heptades. But, strange to say, the remaining heptade is said to have been fulfilled during the life of the Messiah at his first coming. The scripture statement is, that *after the*



sixty-nine heptades, Messiah would be cut off, but not for himself. This all admit to have been fulfilled. But between the cutting off and the seventieth heptade, several things are to occur,—“the people of the prince,” or, as others translate it, “the military commander,” “that shall come, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.” This was fulfilled in the destroying of the temple and Jerusalem by the Romans under Titus, and the after desolation of the Jews. Here, however, as in the vision Daniel saw at the beginning, a wide interval is made between this portion of the prophecy and the last heptade. His end, that is the end of the prince of the Romans, will be “with a flood.” “And he will confirm the covenant with many for one heptade, &c.” This he, being a Roman prince, and not the Messiah. If the Messiah was the he here spoken of, then the passage, as generally expounded, contradicts its (said to be) fulfilment. For instance, if the Messiah was the confirmer of the covenant for this heptade, then in the midst of the week, or, as others translate it, “in one-half of the week,” “the sacrifice and the oblation” ceased. But they did not. For it was five heptades after the cutting off of the Messiah before they ceased. It is testified (Acts xxi.) that the apostle Paul had to shew that he walked orderly, as a Jew, and kept the law—that he had to purify himself—until an offering should have been made for himself, and those accompanying him. These offerings included sacrifices in the temple, so that, from the testimony of scripture, it is evident that the sacrifice and oblation had not ceased after the death and ascension of the Messiah. Again, the confirmation of the covenant is after the destruction of the city and

the sanctuary. If the Messiah is the prince, or the he spoken of, then he should have been cut off after the destruction of the city and sanctuary. If the Messiah was the confirmer of the covenant, how could he confirm it with “thy people” after this destruction? It will be apparent that if we are to accept the statement of scripture, then the prevalent expositions of it are unsound, discrepant, and opposed to the scripture.

The King of Daniel vii. and viii. is to spring out of the ancient Roman Empire, which, as before stated, covered the greater portion of the Greek Empire. The prince who destroyed the city and sanctuary, was a Roman one (Titus, afterwards emperor). Is it not apparent, that he who will confirm the covenant for the one heptade, will also be of Roman power and authority.

This prophecy has relation to the vision previously seen by Daniel. It is by comparing these, that we get a clearer insight into the meaning of this prophecy. In the tenth chapter of Daniel, we meet with a statement, that Daniel considered the thing and comprehended the vision before him. After fasting for twenty-one days, another prophecy is given to him, concerning what shall happen to “thy people in the latter days, for yet the vision is for days.” Then, in the eleventh chapter, we have particulars given. Two visions had been previously seen by Daniel, and now, he has a second prophetic statement, in further elucidation. We cannot go into all the points of gradual increase; so we will proceed at once, to compare the particulars given, concerning the one king, or a king, or a little horn.

THE VISION.

Dan. vii.

1. After the ten kings shall arise another.
2. He will subdue three kings.
3. He will speak words even against the Most High.
4. He will tax the saints of the Most High.
5. Shall devour the whole earth.
6. He will conclude to changes, times, and laws.
7. Until a time, and times, and dividing of tins.
8. Destroy him to the end. The kingdom is given to the people of the saints of the Most High. All dominions shall serve and obey him.

THE VISION.

Dan viii.

- A king of fierce countenance  
His power will be mighty.  
He shall magnify in his Most heart.  
He will destroy the holy and mighty people  
By peace he will destroy multitudes.  
He will cause craft to prosper.

THE PROPHECY.

Dan. ix.

He will confirm the covenant with many for one heptade.  
In the midst of the week.

THE PROPHECY.

Dan. xi.

The king will do according to his will.  
He will exalt himself.  
Shall speak marvellous against the God of gods.  
They that understand shall fall by the sword, &c.  
Shall be corrupt by fatteries.

Such as do wickedly against the covenant.

He will come to his end and none shall help him.

As stated elsewhere, this king will spring out of that portion of the Roman Empire, originally possessed by the four kingdoms, springing out of the Grecian Empire. By careful perusal of the scripture statements, it is evident, that the duration of his power will be seven years. A covenant having been confirmed by him with the Jews for that time, but during the latter part of which, he will cause the sacrifice to cease, and set up the abomination. During this

latter part, which will be for three and a half years, or a time, times, and a dividing of time, the saints will be thoroughly in his power, and remain in that condition, until in his boasting against God, he will bring himself, or be brought, into collision, with a Prince of princes. The result being—his destruction—the delivery of the saints—and, the setting up of the kingdom.

CHRISTIANOS.

(To be continued).

Intelligence, Notes, &c.

INNERLEITHEN.—The small church in this place, formerly numbering only four persons, has now been reduced to three, in consequence of the death of one of the members, named William Nicol, which took place very suddenly and unexpectedly on the 18th inst. The Scotsman newspaper gives the following statement of the manner of his death:—"On Monday evening, Mr William Nicol, grocer, Innerleithen, died suddenly on the road between Tweed Bridge and Traquair. Deceased had his shop in Innerleithen, but had his dwelling house at Traquair, to which he returned every evening. It appears that on the night named he set out as usual to proceed home. Feeling unwell, he went into the toll-house and got a drink of water. Here he met Mr Inglis, schoolmaster of Tra-

quair, and his son, Mr William Inglis of Musselburgh, and the three left the toll together. They had not proceeded far when Mr Nicol complained of a pain in his chest, and almost immediately expired." It is about three years since our deceased brother came to believe the gospel of the kingdom, and to render the obedience of faith; and since that time he has been a devoted student of the Sacred Word, occasionally having been so much absorbed in the study as almost to be forgetful of his business. The brethren at Innerleithen used to meet in his house on the first day of the week. He was a rather elderly man, but unmarried.

MUMBLES.—Since our last report from this place, four persons have been added to the church, having made the good confession, and

been baptized into the Christ. Their names are,—Jane Rees, Thomas Bennet, Walter Whiustone, and David Lewis. The Sunday evening lectures continue to be well attended, and we hope that the ingatherings of the past year are only the first-fruits of an abundant harvest to the glory of God. We are sorry to add that death has entered the house of our brother and sister Jones, and bereaved them of their youngest daughter, after an illness of only seven days. May our Father sustain them, and enable them to say with the good man of old, "The Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away. Blessed be the name of the Lord."

**TURRIFF, &c.**—On the 10th December was baptized at Cuminestown, John Taylor, shoemaker. After a year's investigation, he was able to give a good confession of the faith. On the 14th were united in marriage brother Charles Reid (Cuminestown) and sister Margaret Fraser. Brother Robertson has been displaying his usual diligence in setting forth the word, having been to Inch and Whitehills respectively, speaking to the people, and comforting the brethren; and yet he abates not in his efforts, though smarting under a bereavement in his own family.

\*.\* The great length of the articles furnished in this number has put it out of our power to insert the Response to the Rochester Epistle, and other papers. Will the brethren who write be kind enough to condense and cut down their articles as much as possible? We need a greater variety, and our space is small; besides, short papers are more generally appreciated by the readers.

The Treasurer acknowledges receipts for the *Messenger* from Birmingham, Devonport, Glasgow, Leeds, and Newburgh.

## Publications.

*Important Work for Bible Students,*

**THE EMPHATIC DIAGLOTT**  
Containing the Original Greek Text of

the **NEW TESTAMENT**, according to the Recension of Dr J. GRIESBACH, with an Interlineary Word for Word English Translation: a New Emphatic Version, based on the Interlineary Translation, on the Renderings of Eminent Critics, and on the Various Readings of the Vatican Manuscript; together with Illustrative and Explanatory Foot Notes and a Copious Selection of References; to the whole of which is added a Valuable Alphabetical Appendix.

The above highly important and valuable Work, which has been in course of preparation for the last seven years, is now completed, containing 834 pages, 18mo, and will be supplied at the following prices:—

Plain leather binding, . 16s.

Extra do., gilt or red edges, 18s.

Coloured calf or morocco, do., 20s.

Postage, 4d All orders, accompanied with cash, and addressed to J. WILSON, 53 Northgate, Halifax, will receive prompt attention.

## THE DISCIPLES' CHORAL SERVICE OF BIBLE THEMES,

A collection of Christian Songs,—the subjects selected from the Holy Scriptures, and set to suitable music (in both notations), arranged for four voices. This book, got up expressly for the use of the brethren in their social services, and suitable either for the church or the fireside, is now *reduced in price*, and may be had of G. Dowie, 88 Nicolson Street, Edinburgh,—in a neat printed cover, price 1s.; or in cloth boards, 1s. 6d., post free to any part of the United Kingdom.

*May be had of G. DOWIE,*

**THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES,**

First Series, for 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864; in single volumes, sewed, 1s.; or the four together, in cloth, lettered, 4s. 6d. The two first Nos. of the vol. for 1865 are out of print, but a few copies of the others are still on hand, and may be had at 1d. each. Postage in all cases extra—for single vols., 2d.; for the cloth vols., 6d.

THE MESSENGER IS REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

Articles should be sent in by the 15th of the month, and items of intelligence not later than the 24th; all papers meant for insertion, or notes of intelligence, may be forwarded to **GEORGE DOWIE, 88 NICOLSON STREET**; and all business communications to **JAMES CAMERON, 12 CALTON HILL, EDINBURGH**, to whom money orders should be made payable.

# THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES.

“I SPEAK AS TO WISE MEN, JUDGE YE WHAT I SAY.”

No. 2.

FEBRUARY 1, 1866.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II.

## SPIRITUALIZING.

LANGUAGE is the means by which a person expresses what he feels, thinks, or purposes; and, in order that the means may accomplish the end contemplated, it is indispensable that there be a common understanding between speaker and hearer, regarding the import of the terms employed. In *conversation* any defect in this matter can be remedied by explanation; but *written* language, to convey the correct idea of the writer, must be used, and understood, according to certain rules, else uncertainty, error, and confusion are the necessary results. The three following rules, laid down by Judge Lewis, seem to us fair, necessary, and complete:—

“1st. We are bound to understand what a speaker or writer says to us, in that sense and meaning which he intends to convey; and his meaning and intention are always to be collected from the true and legitimate meaning of the language he employs, as that is settled by universal usage and consent.”

“2nd. The literal sense is the true and legitimate sense of language to which we are bound to adhere in our interpretation of what any writer or speaker says to us, except in those cases where it is *apparent* from the subject considered, in connection with the language employed, that its author intended it to be used in a figurative sense.”

“3rd. If no such intention be *apparent* in what any writer or speaker says, still if we

understand it in its literal sense, it may involve an absurdity, or conflict with something he has stated elsewhere; in such cases we not only may, but are bound to, reject the literal meaning, and seek for a figurative interpretation that will remove the difficulty, and render consistent all the author has said.”

It is plain that the foregoing applies to “the holy scriptures,” in common with all other writings; yet it is only by disregarding these rules, in reading the scriptures, that so many, and so conflicting explanations have been given of the writings of the holy prophets and apostles. If the Bible is a *revelation* of the will and purposes of God to man, we are bound to understand its terms, according to the same rules we apply to any other writings. “To adopt any other method” (says Greswell, a learned author) “of arriving at the true sense of the Scripture, is to substitute an indefinite and capricious standard of interpretation, taken from, I know not what, imaginary notions and preconceived opinions of the interpreter himself, and consequently of as many kinds as there are expositors, all equally arbitrary, precarious, and unsatisfactory, to any but those who set them up, and apply them.”

It will be observed that, in the rules quoted, there are only two senses in which ordinary language is understood, namely, *the literal* and *the figurative*; but interpreters of the Bible assert that the language of the scriptures is sometimes employed in a sense different from these. This additional sense they term *the spiritual*,—a sense never sought for in the language of any other book. Well, what is meant by *the spiritual* sense of a passage? Not the figurative, for that sense is as apparent, where it is used, as the literal; for a sentence cannot be used in a figurative sense, unless a figure be expressed or implied, and every term in such a sentence must have a *literal* signification; because a figure of speech is not in the *terms* of a sentence, but in their *application to subjects to which they do not properly belong*. For instance, in the sentence, "Fear not, Abram, I am thy shield," all the terms must be understood in their literal sense before the import of the figure, evidently implied in the language, can be properly apprehended. Neither does *the spiritual* sense mean *the symbolic*, which differs somewhat from the *figurative*, and is sometimes used in the sacred writings; but by the *spiritual* sense, is meant *the mystic*, which is in no way *expressed*, but rather *concealed* by the terms used. The character of this *spiritual* sense will, however, be better understood by examples of the mode in which interpreters employ it. Thus, on Isa. lxx. 17-25, M'Culloch affirms that—"Behold I create a new heavens and a new earth," means, "I am about to give my church a new and beautiful form by introducing a new dispensation of grace." When Jehovah says, "Behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing." "By Jerusalem is meant the church of

God under the New Testament." "The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock;" i.e., "The wolf, which is an exceeding fierce, rapacious creature, and greedy of devouring its prey, exhibits a striking emblem of the barbarous enemies of the flock of Jesus Christ. The lamb, well known for its innocence, blamelessness, and usefulness, significantly represents the disciples of Jesus Christ, who are distinguished for humility. The lion, exhibits a proper emblem of the powerful blood-thirsty adversaries of the people of God. The bullock, may be considered as symbolical of the laborious useful servants of God. Concerning people of these contrary tempers, our prophet foretells that those of the former sort, being divested of their ferocity and enmity by the influence of the Holy Ghost, and rendered mild and peaceable, they shall familiarly feed together, . . . on the doctrines of the gospel," which doctrines, the author says, are represented by *straw*! After the same fashion, the declaration of the angel of the Lord to Mary, that her child should sit on the throne of his father David, and reign over the house of Jacob for ever (Luke i. 32), means, sitting at the right hand of Jehovah in the heavens, and reigning in the hearts of God's people on earth. *Jerusalem, Zion, the mountain* of the house of the Lord—the *temple* itself, all mean the *Gentile Church*. *Israel* returning to their own land, means *the conversion of the heathen* to christianity, &c., &c.

Such is the method of *spiritualizing* the scriptures. *Obscuring* would be a far fitter term.

In Rev. xi. 8. we read of a city "which *spiritually* is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified;" but this use of the term

*spiritual* is very different from that to which we are adverting. This is simply designating "the city where our Lord was crucified," by the names of places which it resembled in wickedness and impiety, just as Jehovah had reproved its wicked rulers and inhabitants by his prophet Isaiah, many centuries before. "Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah—to what purpose is your sacrifice," &c. Nowhere in the scriptures do we find the term *pneumatikos* used in the sense contended for by these perverters of the word of God. *Spiritual*, in scripture, means according to the Spirit, just as *carnal* means according to the flesh. The prophets "SPOKE as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," (2. Peter i. 21.) and the apostles spoke in words, which the Holy Spirit taught them (1 Cor. ii. 13), consequently those who interpret these Spirit-given words by their own conceptions, or according to laws of correspondence of their own framing, *carnalize* the words of the Spirit of God to their own, and their neighbour's hurt. This system of so-called spiritualizing was introduced to the adherents of the doctrine of Christ, in the third century, by Origen, who has been styled "the father of biblical criticism." Deeply imbued with the Neoplatonic philosophy, and the puerile allegorizing of the Jewish Rabbins, whatever he found in scripture contradicting his notions of truth and propriety, he explained according to what he termed the *spiritual* sense. He affirmed that "as man consists, according to Plato, of body, soul, and spirit, so Scripture has a threefold sense;"—that is, the literal, intellectual, and allegorical, or mystic. By this means he got rid of Eden, Adam, and Eve,

or whatever in scripture conflicted with his philosophy. This is the man who in our day is, by the professed adherents of Christianity, styled "The father of biblical criticism and exegesis in Christendom;" and, from their point of view, justly so, for those principles of interpretation with which his name is identified, and by which the words of God are made void, are contended for, and applied with filial faithfulness, in the present day, by almost every contributor to religious literature. The instances we have cited of this spiritualizing process, regarding the language of Isa. lxv. 17, and Luke i. 32, are but a sample of the mode by which almost, if not every, article of real scriptural faith and hope has been explained away. The promises God made to Abraham of an inheritance of the land he shewed to him.—The promises made to David, that his seed should sit for ever on his throne.—The restoration of Israel to their own land, having the law of God written in their hearts.—The restoration of the kingdom to Israel.—The coming again from the heavens of the Lord Jesus to sit on the throne of David on mount Zion.—The resurrection of the saints at his appearing, and their reigning with him over the nations.—The resurrection of the rest of the dead when the thousand years are finished.—The making of a new heavens and new earth.—The descent of the New Jerusalem. All this is at the present hour denied by some sect or other, substituting, in place of these glorious realities, some figment of their own vain fancy. Were the Lord to make his descent to earth just now, how truly should we find his words verified, "When the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth." Faith in the hopes of the gospel is rare indeed; and even

where it exists, it is sadly diluted by *fancy*. Let the faithful in Christ Jesus beware of the vain philosophy taught by Origen; for, even among the believers of the gospel of the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, the principle and practice of spiritualizing is growing in favour. It has indeed existed among us, to a small extent, for a long time; for has not the coming of the Lord, spoken of by himself in Matt. xxiv., been interpreted *a la spiritualizing*, to signify the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; and the events described in 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12, by the same process, metamorphosed into the dissolution of the Jewish state? Such applications of this deliterious principle of interpretation has, we say, existed for a long time amongst us, and now it seems on the increase, some even affirming that "the sea," which, when the thousand years are finished, is said to "give up the dead which are in it" (Rev. xx. 13), and of which there is ultimately to be "no more," (Rev. xxi. 1), does not mean "sea," but *nations*. It is plain that we only require to apply the same method to the "first resurrection (as has already

been done by others) to get quit of it, and of every other object of our hope in the age to come. Beloved, let us beware of the false principles of the apostacy. Is it not the case, that on every point where we differ from the sects, we differ simply because we adhere to the plain, obvious, and ordinary meaning of the words of God, from which they have, unhappily, departed? I know we are desirous to maintain our faith in purity, therefore have I called attention to a false principle of understanding the scriptures, which, I have reason to fear, is stealing insidiously into the household of faith. Let each of us be able to say, in the face of all men, "*There is no doctrine of my creed,—no article of my faith, which I cannot express correctly in the unaltered words of scripture; and I am determined, God helping me, to hold fast the form of sound words, in faith and love, which I have learned in the holy scriptures.*"

W. L.

*Note.*—For the quotations in the early part of this article, I am indebted to an article quoted from an American print in the "Quarterly Journal of Prophecy," October 1865.

## AN ENGLISH REPLY TO THE ROCHESTER EPISTLE.

THE disciples of Christ meeting in Edward Street, Birmingham, England, send this letter greeting, to the assembly meeting in Rochester, New York; and to all of like faith and hope, wherever gathered together.

May favour, mercy, and peace, be unto you, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

With pleasure your letter, addressed to believers in the gospel, was perused. Its exhortation to unity being ever wanted, by reason of the non-presence of the infallible Head amongst us,—He who alone possesses the right to enforce obedience to any teaching that we at present find in the Scriptures. Unity in the faith, is indeed much to be de-

sired, but such unity cannot be obtained unless attention be given to the utterance of the apostle,—"*Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.*" Let any teaching said to be of the Scriptures be brought to the test of the Scriptures, and accepted or rejected according as it agrees with them or no. This would be productive of more unison. The neglect of the privilege of searching the scriptures daily, as did the Bereans of old, as to whether the things taught are so or no, is productive of more disunion than any other failing to which the believer may be liable. The teaching of inferences, suppositions, or dogmas, would soon be thrown aside were this privilege of more extensive use, and in

its place substituted the truth taught in the scriptures. Habitual exercise of the faculties in their use is necessary in order to enable us to discriminate between the good and evil; and such exercise is not to be lightly esteemed. The necessity is proved by the palpable truth which meets us face to face in reading publications designed for the use of the *disciples*, as well as in the things heard orally. This truth is the constant repeating of first principles or elements; proving either lukewarmness or indifference on the part of many at least. Whereas, in order to progress, or to be skilled in the word of righteousness, it is necessary to put on one side the milk fit only for babes or neophytes, and to digest the strong meat fit for those of full age.

We repeat that it is by reason of the insistence of *the necessity* for believing inferences, suppositions and dogmas, in order to fellowship, that want of unity is caused. They who insist on this necessity are *the cause* of division, and it is to them the words of the apostle pointedly apply,—“Mark them which *cause* divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.” It is a duty as plainly devolving upon the believer to come out from fellowship with those who cause division, as it was for him to come out of the world in order to prove himself a believer. It is stated in the letter written by the apostle John that he wrote to the congregation,—“but Diotrephes, who loves to be first amongst them, does not receive us; and, not being satisfied with these things, he does not even receive the brethren, and forbids and casts out of the congregation those wishing to do so.” The cast out were willing to receive the brethren—brethren so named by an apostle—but the seeker of pre-eminence, with his supporters, was not. *But the apostle John here holds out the right hand of fellowship to those whom the so called congregation of Christ regarded as excommunicated men.*

The utterance of the apostle Peter should constitute the *rule* by which teaching intended for the believers should be tested. He says,—“No prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation, for holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.” That is to say, scripture should be interpreted in the light of its own utterances. With the mass of the teachings contained in the professing religious publications of this age the believer has nothing in common. Imitating the manners and customs of their worldly co-peers, they make their statements to partake of a sensational character, gratifying itching ears at the expense of truth. With them the pure, undefiled well of wisdom is not to be found. Far better is it for the believer to take the

scriptures and search for the wisdom hidden within its pages. Should his perception of it appear dim, then, without any wavering or hesitancy of faith, let him ask of the Father of Lights, with whom is no variableness or shadow of turning, for the wisdom which cometh from Him alone; and so asking, he will receive it.

While *unlearned* questions are to be avoided, yet it is obvious that questions conducive to learning are to be embraced. For is it not written of “The Revelation,”—“Blessed is he who reads, and those who hear, the words of the prophecy, and observe the things written in it, for the time is near.” And we know that “the faith cometh by hearing, and the hearing by the Word of God.” It is for the *faith* we are to contend earnestly. Yet this earnest contention is compatible with the meekness necessary in those who instruct the opposers of the *truth*. Eager, understanding contention is far different to a quarrelsome, wrangling contention. The contention of the disciple is the earnest desire to dispel the ignorance in the minds of those who, being darkened in the understanding, are alienated from the life of God through that ignorance which is in them, because of the *stupidity of the heart*.

Most heartily do we agree with you in considering the adoption of a distinguishing name by any body of professing believers other than what is to be found in the scriptures, as unjustifiable. Not only is it unjustifiable, but *un-scriptural*. Old-fashioned, abused, and scriptural as it is, yet is the name Christian far more preferable than any of the newly invented or sectarian names now prevalent. “If any man suffer as a *Christian*,” saith the apostle Peter, “let him not be ashamed, but glorify God on this behalf.” With parties who assume names not to be found sanctioned by use of the apostles, or their hearers, the disciple of Christ can have no fellowship. Partizan names are always to be found identified with partizan teaching. To be named with the name of Christ is sufficient for the disciple. Holding fast to the Head, all in the same bond of fellowship can with safety look forward to his appearance, the second time, without sin unto salvation.

We also agree with you, that personalities of all kinds should be avoided by the believers,—it is with *principles* we have to contend. With so-called interpretations of the faith, and not with the faith, we have to combat. Personalities are usually the refuge of those who cannot find arguments to support their assertions. It is by use of these vile weapons that scripture truth is endeavoured to be hindered in its progress. But the



standing reproof of the Lord is, "Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone." The use of personalities, in the truest acceptation of the word, is the right only of him who was without sin or fault at all. Who is there amongst the disciples who can say this of himself? "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If any man sin, *we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.*"

To you, then, we would hold out the right hand of fellowship. Bearing witness as your letter does by its internal evidence to your desire to co-operate with those whose hope is "the hope of Israel." To us, the disciples, there is no distinction of race or clime,—no ties of clanship or feudal servitude,—all are one in *Christ Jesus*. Whether the government under which we live be imperial or republican matters not to us. All powers that be are ordained of God; to them we yield obedience, looking for deliverance *when* he comes whose right it is to reign—*then*, the triumph of the believer;—*now* the cross, *then* the crown.

What better exhortation to union can we use than that of the apostle Paul,—“I exhort you, therefore, *I*, the prisoner of the Lord, to walk worthy of the calling with which you were called; with all humility and gentleness, with patience sustaining each other in love; using diligence to preserve

the unity of the Spirit by the uniting bond of peace; there being one Body and one Spirit, as also you were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one immersion; one God and Father of all; he who is over all, and through all, and in all.”

Amidst the turmoils, quarrels, personalities, and divisions of the sects, the disciple ever relies upon his master, Christ. Through his strength he is able to bear and forbear; to pray for and love his enemies, as well as friends. Ignored, cast out as none of theirs, down-trodden, yet uprising, he may be; yet his hope and anchor resting in the heavens is firm and sure. Knowing that “what things were written aforetime for our instruction *were* written that we through *the patience and consolation of the scriptures might possess the hope.*”

“And may the God of that patience and that consolation give you the same disposition toward each other, according to Christ Jesus; so that with one mind and with one mouth you may glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

“Now, unto the King aonian, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for the ages of ages. Amen.”

May his love, the favour of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, be ever with the Israel of God. Amen.

GEO. HATFIELD.  
HENRY BRITAIN.  
M. A. HATFIELD.

Birmingham, Dec. 1865.

## THE GOSPEL

THAT WAS PREACHED BY THE LORD JESUS AND HIS APOSTLES  
TO JEW AND GENTILE.\*

In all writings, human or divine, terms are employed both in a primary and secondary sense. In a secondary sense, the term “gospel” is applied to the cross of Christ, in 1 Cor. i. 17, 18; and in the same secondary sense, to the kingdom of God, in Gal. iii. 8. We say that the term gospel is only applied to the kingdom of God in a secondary sense;

for the Jews believed in the kingdom of God even when they rejected the gospel. It was of believers in the kingdom of God that Paul said, “As touching the gospel they are enemies for your sakes.” And that this term “gospel” is only used in a secondary sense, when applied to the death of Christ, as a sacrifice for sin, is evident, from this that the apostles preached the gospel long before they either understood or believed in the death of Christ.

What then is the primary, strict,

\* From “The Reflector of Divine Truth,” reprinted by request, and with the full permission of the author.

original meaning of the term gospel in the New Testament? What was that gospel which Jesus and his apostles preached to Jew and Gentile? To the candid reader we submit, on the following scriptural evidence, that it was, strictly speaking, neither more nor less than this—"The kingdom of God is at hand."

Was not this the gospel which the prophets predicted that Jesus and his apostles should preach? As it is written—"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, "Thy God reigneth!"—Isa. lii. 7; Nahum i. 15; Rom. x. 15. An attentive examination of the passages will show that the words—"thy God reigneth," are intended to comfort Israel under the fierce rage of anti-christ; consequently that it is just a prophetic way of saying "thy God is about to reign," or "the reign or kingdom of God is at hand."

And as the prophets said, so it came to pass. For after John was put into prison, Jesus came into Galilee preaching the good news concerning the kingdom of God, and saying—"The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the good news," Mark i. 14, 15. With regard to the apostles—These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying—"Go not into the way of the Gentiles; and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; and as ye go preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand." Luke ix. 2 and 6, should be viewed in connection with this quotation from Matth. x. 5, 6, 7. Luke says that Jesus sent the twelve to preach the kingdom of God. But

Matthew shows that Luke means, "the gospel of the kingdom of God."

Three times at least Jesus predicted that "this gospel of the kingdom should be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations," Matth. xxiv. 14; Mark xiii. 10; Mark xiv. 9. And in accordance with these predictions, after his resurrection, he commissioned the apostles to "go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," Mark xvi. 15.

Neither in his gospel, nor in "The Acts," does Luke represent the preachers of the gospel as ever using these words, "the kingdom of God is at hand." But in both these precious portions of the sacred writings he represents these preachers as delivering in other words the same gospel. In his gospel he represents the seventy as assuring the Jews that the kingdom of God was come nigh unto them, Luke x. 9-12; and in "The Acts," he represents Peter connecting together, as nearly simultaneous events, the wonders of Pentecost, and those "wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath," which usher in the coming and kingdom of Christ, Acts ii.

In nearly all the epistles, the day, the coming, and the kingdom of Christ, are represented as being at hand, Rom. xiii. 11, 12; 1 Cor. vii. 29; Heb. x. 37; James v. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 7; Rev. xii. 12, are examples. That the apostles had preached the proximity of the kingdom before they thus wrote of it, is clear from the expressly mentioned fact that they announced, not the near approach of the day of Christ as a new thing, but only stirred up the minds of the brethren by way of remembrance. 2 Peter iii. The passage, 2 Thess. ii. 2, is an exception only by a false translation. The original word for "at hand" is everywhere else ren-

dered "present," or "come." Paul blames not the Thessalonians for believing that the day of Christ was at hand; but for believing it had come. [Clement, Paul's fellow-labourer, in one of his epistles to the Corinthians, expressly declares that the apostles, after the ascension of Messiah, went abroad among all nations, preaching that the kingdom of God was at hand.]

In the New Testament, the fact of the kingdom being at hand, made, from Matthew to Revelation, the main ground of repentance. Jesus began by saying,—“Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand;” and this doctrine is carried onward to the end by his apostles, till it is again taken up by himself in the Apocalypse. But nowhere do we perceive the least vestige of *this* doctrine,—“Repent, for the kingdom of God *is* come.” On the contrary, the coming of the kingdom puts an end to the space for repentance. The kingdom being come, instead of repent (reform or amend your lives), the awful sentence goes forth,—“He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still,” Rev. xxii. 11. When the Lord is come, and the righteous are, for the first time, invited to enter into his kingdom, then shall the king say to the wicked, not, repent, but, “depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire; prepared for the devil and his angels.”

It is true, indeed, that 1800 years have elapsed since it was said, “The kingdom of God is at hand.” Hence ignorant scoffers have, as was predicted, arisen, “walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming?” But “one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.”

On the whole, then, we conclude

that the primary meaning of the term gospel is,—The fact of the kingdom of God being at hand. This is the ground of gospel repentance. On no other point are the teachings of Jesus more frequent or solemn, Matt. xxiv. 42-51; Mark xiv. 24-37; Luke xii. 35-48, &c., &c. And with the reception or rejection of no other truth did the Lord ever more solemnly connect the salvation or condemnation of men, Matt. x. 14, 15; Mark xvi. 15, 16. L.

\* [The above article had lain over a month, in consequence of some doubt as to the precise meaning of the writer. Upon being referred to, he furnished the following in explanation:—“With regard to the kingdom being at hand, when I said that this was, in the strict original meaning of the term, The Gospel, I just meant what I said. . . . That the kingdom of God is at hand—is a great scriptural truth, the meaning and bearings of which have only to be fully explained, to show the propriety of its being entitled to the appellation of “The Gospel.” Matt. x. 7, 14, 15, and Mark xvi. 15, 16, very clearly show that man's eternal condition was suspended upon his reception of it. That Jesus is the Christ, is also a very important scriptural truth; the Christian Church is built upon it; to believe and confess it, is essential to salvation. Yet all this may be true without making it out to be The Gospel, in the strict primary sense of the term. The scriptural gospel, or good news, is the gospel of, or concerning the Kingdom. Now, the good news which Jesus preached concerning the kingdom; was just this, that it was at hand. Jesus did not preach the kingdom itself to the Jews: the prophets did that. Neither did Jesus, as a general thing, preach to the Jews, that He was the Messiah: and he particularly enjoined his apostles, more than once, not to do so; while their daily employment was to preach the gospel.

Hence, that Jesus is the Messiah, is not the original gospel; yet it is very closely connected with it; for the fact, that the Messiah has come in the flesh, that he has appeared as the seed of David, that he has been rejected and crucified, as was before written; that he has sat down at the right hand of God, that he is therefore ready to come—as it were—at a moment's warning:—all this is comprised in the proposition, that Jesus is the Christ.

\* This appendix also appeared in the Reflector.

And all agree with and confirm the gospel that the kingdom of God is at hand. Hence, in a secondary sense, and because thus connected with it, we may call these things the gospel. Thus;—Paul says, ‘Remember that Jesus the Christ . . . was raised from the dead, according to my gospel.’—2 Tim. ii 8. How according to Paul’s gospel! ‘Repent, for God has appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead’—Acts xvii. 31. Thus, Jesus as the Messiah, the Lord’s ordained, or anointed, was raised from the dead, because the kingdom of God was at hand, or, in other words, because God had appointed a day of judgment; as predicted in Psalms xcvi. and xcviiii.]

As the subject of the foregoing paper has of late been made to assume more importance than formerly, it will not be deemed out of place to accompany it with a few remarks, not intended as a complete exposition of the subject, but simply as indicative of a scriptural settlement of it.

The definition at the close of L’s explanatory note, is one which has often been given as the sense in which “the Kingdom of God is at hand” was preached to the Gentiles. It is a definition in which every disciple heartily concurs. It is as follows:—“BECAUSE THE KINGDOM OF GOD WAS AT HAND, OR, IN OTHER WORDS, BECAUSE GOD HATH APPOINTED A DAY OF JUDGEMENT.” Now if “the Kingdom of God is at hand,” in the mouth of John the Baptist, Jesus and the twelve before Pentecost, is the same thing in the mouth of Paul, as “God hath appointed a day of judgment,” which latter declaration every disciple rejoices to believe, why should not this be satisfactory to every reasonable mind? If PROXIMITY can be so easily resolved into future CERTAINTY, why should not future certainty be accepted for proximity.

Again L. asks, “was not this the gospel which the prophets predicted that Jesus and his apostles should preach?” As it is written—“How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings . . . that saith unto Zion, “Thy God reigneth.” It is just a prophetic way of saying, “thy God is about to reign,” or, “the reign or Kingdom of God is at hand.” It is well known that the prophetic sense of such an expression as “thy God reigneth,” is simply “Thy God shall reign.” This, if understood as a prediction of the preaching of Jesus—“the Kingdom of God is at hand,” affirms no more than future certainty, and is singularly confirmatory of Paul’s definition—

“God hath appointed a day of judgment.” And so as L. says, “As the prophets said so it came to pass.”

The opening statements of paragraphs 7 and 8, are singularly wanting in proof, in the very point needing it. Thus:—

“In the New Testament the kingdom being at hand, made from Matthew to Revelation, the main ground of repentance.”

“In nearly all the epistles, the day, the coming, and the Kingdom of Christ, are represented as being at hand. Rom. xiii. 11, 12; 1 Cor. vii. 29; Heb. x. 37; James v. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 7; Rev. xii. 12, are examples.”

But supposing this point to be disposed of, and that we are confined in our inquiry to the four evangelists—is it quite certain that the proximity of the kingdom constituted the gospel of the kingdom? The proof text in Mark i. 14, 15, seems to read more naturally another way. It reads, “Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God, AND saying, the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand! repent ye, and believe the gospel.” The question here is, Is the intimation and command in verse 15 explanatory of, or in addition to, the preaching of verse 14. If explanatory, the word “and” must be omitted, thus, “preaching the gospel of the Kingdom, saying, the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand,” &c. This is a point, therefore, which must be proved from some other source than this standard proof-text.

But it is said here “the Jews believed in the Kingdom of God, even when they rejected the gospel.” The inference intended to be drawn from this is that the gospel must have been something else, than the mere future establishment of the Kingdom. But this is not so self-evident as is assumed. If one were to say, those Jews who rejected the gospel did not believe in the Kingdom, it would be more easily proved. Who rejected the gospel? The ruling and influential classes, the chief priests, Scribes, Pharisees, and rulers of the people, constituting “ALL JERUSALEM,” and a considerable portion of the provinces. This whole party had for many years been dependent for place and power on the patronage of Rome. Patriotism was thus eaten out of their nature, and loyal allegiance to the theocracy of their fathers had no place in their hearts. “How can ye believe who receive honour one of another?” was the cutting inquiry of Jesus presented to this very class. “Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me.”

Now it was to the nation as a nation, and as represented by this very party, that the testimony of Jesus was mainly borne. He never claimed the Messiahship except when challenged by them. This came to a point

after his apprehension, when placed before the high priest and Roman Governor. His words before Pilate were—"Thou sayest that I am a King. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth."

The representative character of the ruling party is seen in the lament of Jesus over Jerusalem, apostrophising it as the responsible representative of the nation—"If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side. And shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." Thus the nation through its rulers is proved to have lost faith in their kingdom, and was consequently unprepared to acknowledge their king. Even thirty

years before this, Herod and ALL JERUSALEM with him were troubled at the inquiry of the wise men—"Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" Why should all Jerusalem have been troubled at the birth of the King of the Jews? The only answer is, they had lost faith in the Kingdom, because they were satisfied with the position they had secured, and feared to risk losing it.

"The common people heard Jesus gladly"—although few would acknowledge his Messiahship, probably through fear of the ruling party, see John ix. 22. This acknowledgment was the turning point, although not preached either as gospel or otherwise.

L says "the Kingdom of God is at hand" is the primary strict original meaning of the term gospel in the New Testament." Gal. iii. 8, contains the most original, strict, and primary sense of the term gospel—"In thee, Abraham, shall all nations be blessed;" and here proximity is awaiting, except in the sense of future certainty.

J. C.

## THE LITTLE HORN.

### THE ANTICHRIST.

THERE is one particular feature of this King given in Daniel xi. to which we would refer more particularly. He is said, not to regard the God of his fathers, "*nor the desire of women.*" We are fully aware that this is generally applied to "the forbidding to marry," of the Apostle Paul. This being however one of the features of *the apostacy*, or *falling away*, and not of the Man of Sin. Other characteristics are given of *the apostacy*, as well as this by the apostle. The best of these, is applicable to every church, sect, or ism, now existing to a greater or less extent, and not to any one in particular. But this peculiarity described by Daniel, belongs to this King. We think it applies in a manner not generally understood. Previous to this, Isaiah had uttered his "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and

call his name Immanuel," (vii. 14) "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder," (ix. 6). Micah had said "out of thee shall he come forth unto me to be ruler in Israel," (v. 2). Jeremiah, "I will raise up *unto David* a righteous branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute justice and judgment in the earth. *In his days* Judah shall be saved, and Israel dwell safely," (xxiii. 5). Haggai, "The desire of all nations shall come," (ii. 7). Matthew, "Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled. Behold a virgin shall be with child," (i. 23). Luke gives the salutation of Elizabeth, "Elizabeth was filled with the *Holy Spirit*, and she spoke out with a loud voice, and said, Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, and whence

is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" And the song of Mary, in what she says. "He hath regarded the low estate of his handmaiden, for, behold, from henceforth, all generations shall call me blessed," (Luke i. 41 to 55). To be the mother of the child, who should deliver Israel from their enemies, who should reign in peace and righteousness, the Messiah, the Prince of peace, was indeed the desire of the faithful women of Israel. All generations of the faithful since,

Daniel (vii, viii, ix, xi).

Horn that had eyes, mouth that spoke very great things, (vii).

A King of fierce countenance, understanding dark sentences, (viii).

He shall exalt and magnify himself above every god, (xi).

They shall take away his dominion to consume and destroy it, (vii).

He shall be broken without hand, (viii).

That determined shall be poured out upon the desolator, (ix).

He shall come to his end, &c., (xi).

He shall stand up against the Prince of princes, (viii).

He shall speak words against the Most High, (vii).

He shall magnify himself in his heart, (viii).

Magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, (xi).

They shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate (xi.)

The portion of the letter of the Apostle Paul we have quoted, had reference to a conversation which he had held with the Thessalonian assembly, while dwelling among them. He distinctly warns them against any thing which might trouble them, or cause them to think that the day of Christ was close at hand. They had forgotten that God does not count slackness as men do. The apostacy was to precede the revealing of the man of sin. True, the mystery of iniquity was already working in his time, and has been working ever since. The Apostle John also says, the spirit of antichrist was already in the world. Many antichrists have existed, and do exist, but THE ANTICHRIST has yet to appear. The Lord testified,

do indeed reckon the mother of the Lord, as blessed among women. The desire of women referred to in Daniel, is He, who also is the desire of all nations; the Lord Jesus Christ. It is He for whom this King will have no regard, as well as none for God. The apostle John declares also, (ii. 22), "This is the antichrist, the one denying the Father and the Son."

By farther comparison we are enabled also to identify this King of Daniel with the Man of Sin of the Apostle Paul.

The Apostle Paul. 2 Thessalonians, ii.

That Man of Sin, (ver. 3).

Then will the lawless one be revealed. (Or that wicked be revealed).

That Son of destruction (3), or (the Son of perdition).

Whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth.

And shall destroy with the brightness of his coming, (8)

Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, (4).

So that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God (4).

"I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not; if another shall come in his own name him ye will receive."

Denial of the Father and the Son, united with the admitted claim of his subjects to rule by right of his own authority, is one of the prominent characteristics of the antichrist. It is true that every body of men claiming to be the disciples of Christ, is more or less an antichrist, or more or less a portion of the apostacy, according as their teaching and practice agrees or disagrees with the teaching and practice inculcated in the scriptures. But there is no historical record of any such body denying the authority of the Father and the Son. All, to a great or less extent, claim to

act by authority of the Son, while yet absent from the earth; but this claim is a virtual admission of the Son's power, and not a denial of it. This power to act may consist of the claim to act, by right of descent from the apostles commissioned by the Son, or by the professed following after the teaching and practice of the apostles. None have ventured to claim authority in their *own name*, and of their *own will*. As then history presents no record of the existence of this, *the antichrist*, what is reserved yet for the view of the disciples? The removal of the apostacy, as at present existing, by means of the setting up of the consummation of the apostacy, *the antichrist, the Man of Sin, or the King magnifying himself against God*.

In the application of this name antichrist to the Papacy, a *series of men* rulers is made to be equal to a *man* of sin. Or, in another form, about two hundred and seventy popes or bishops, sixteen anti-popes or bishops, and one woman pope, are made equal to *one man*. Neither was, or is, the Papacy made up of *one dynasty*, or of *one nation*, or *one race*. Its rulers have belonged to the city of Rome, to Greece, Sardinia, Tuscany, Naples, Syria, Sicily, Ger-

many, Saxony, France, Portugal, Spain, and England. Besides this *one king* is to be destroyed when standing up against the Prince of princes. How can the *rulers* of the Papacy be so destroyed, unless they be first risen from the dead? As no scripture authorizes us to understand that an occurrence of this nature will take place, it is not possible to make the papacy equal to this one king, even if the others rose from the dead to submit themselves to this one, or answer to the antichrist. Again, we are compelled to believe *the antichrist has yet to be*.

Let us now turn to that which is commonly received as the closing record of the scriptures, the "revelation of Jesus Christ"—apocalypse or revelation, not apocalypses or revelations. The thirteenth chapter will for the present occupy our minds. Notices of the twelfth and seventeenth chapters, being reserved for consideration under a different heading. Resorting to our usual method of comparing spiritual things with spiritual, as being the briefest method of bringing the similarity of scripture teaching before the reader, we give a short table of comparison between John's account and Daniel's:—

Dan. ii.	Dan. vii	Dan. viii.	Rev. xiii.
	Four great beasts came up from the sea.		A beast rise up out of the sea.
Head of Gold.	Lion with eagles' wings		Lion mouth.
Breast and Arms Silver	Bear raised on one side	Ram with two horns.	Bear feet.
Belly and thighs of brass.	Leopard with four wings of fowl, &c.	The he-goat.	Like a Leopard.
Legs of iron.	Fourth beast iron teeth.		Seven heads (one head wounded to death,) and ten horns.
Feet and Toes of the feet.	Ten horns or kings.	Out of one a little horn.	(The beast itself.)
	Little horn plucks up three horns.		

By referring back to the comparison of Daniel's statements, just before given, the points of resemblance between the beast described by John, and the little horn of Daniel, will be at once perceived. Being briefly:—

1. A mouth speaking great things and blasphemies, (v. 5.)

2. Power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations, (v. 7.)

3. He opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme *his name*, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in the heaven, (v. 6.)

4. It was given him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them, (v. 7.)

5. All that dwell upon the earth shall worship him (v. 8.)

6. Power was given unto him to continue 42 months, (v. 5.)

7. I saw the beast make war against him that sat on the horse, the beast was taken, cast alive into a lake of fire, (Rev. xix 19, 20.)

The beast described in the apocalypse is alike, in some one or other of the features belonging to the four beasts, and the little horn of Daniel.

The four beasts have altogether seven heads and ten horns; so has the one beast of the apocalypse. In the latter time of their kingdom, a king of fierce countenance is to stand up: one of the heads of the beast is as it were wounded to death, *but* is afterwards healed.

The little horn arises *after* the ten kings and four beasts, or seven heads, have existed: the beast of the apocalypse when it arises has seven heads, and ten crowned horns. The identity of the little horn, with the apocalyptic beast, is at once established.

If it is an historical truth, that the seventh head of the fourth beast, was the Roman Empire, it has long since received a deadly stroke. It, not having existed in *entirety*, for nearly fifteen hundred years. It is also a truth as well known, that no ten kings have yet appeared contemporaneously out of this empire. What then is the teaching of the prophecy?

Ten kings are to arise on the territory of the Ancient Roman Empire; of whom, three are to be subdued by a king, who will arise after them.

The power of this after king, will be a maritime, as well as a terrene one, and his empire will embrace portions of earth of the four great empires, which were included within the limits of the old Roman Empire.

The saints are to be given into his hand, or power, for a time, times,

and a dividing of time, or for forty and two months.

A time, times, and a half, is equal to three and a half years, as is also forty two months. This is certain, for it was said, of Nebuchadnezzar; "seven times shall pass over him." The fulfilment occupied seven years, proving what the duration of a time is. The Septuagint also translates this passage, "seven years," the half of the one heptade is equal also to three and a half years. The uniformity of agreement, in the length of time, to be understood in each of these phrases, is proof, that no other length of time, but the natural, which cannot but be literal, is intended. It is for this brief period, that this king will be permitted to do according to his will. The declaration of scripture, concerning the necessity of this brevity, being, if those days were not to be short, no flesh should be saved; but for the sake of the elect, those days shall be shortened.

The Papacy cannot be this little horn or beast, because it has not, nor has it ever had, power over *all* kindreds, and tongues, and nations. Neither has it ever *overcome* the saints; or done according to *his* will. Nor has it confirmed a covenant with the Jews for a period of seven years. Nor possessed territory in, or overruled in, all the countries covered by the empire of the four beasts. But it *has* existed nearly eighteen hundred years as a part of the apostacy, which period of existence cannot be made by any process of which we have knowledge, equal to three and a half years.

If the times, or the years, or the months, or the days, are equal to twelve hundred and sixty years, how is it that these things have not occurred under the Papacy? True, the Papacy has persecuted and op-



pressed wherever it could, but so have many of its opponents also, whenever they (as they considered) thought it necessary. Persecution is a feature *not* confined to the Papal branch of the apostacy, but to be found as well among its adversaries, branches also of the apostacy.

We repeat, it is arrogating to himself the right of ruling, instead of, and independent of, the Creator and the Redeemer, which will enable the disciples to know *him* as the antichrist, with whom they have to contend even unto death. Pride and self-sufficiency will, in his apostacy and infidelity, find its culminating point; and it may be better said of him than of any other of the human family, pride will precede destruction, and a haughty spirit precede a fall.

It will be apparent, from the tenor of our remarks, that no reliance is placed, neither can there be, upon the statements of expositors, who *fix* a period for the termination of the apostacy, and the coming of the Lord. All periods mentioned in this paper have relation to the antichrist, and as he has not yet appeared, it is obvious that it is utterly impossible to *fix the termination before* he has *commenced* to reign. The times and the seasons are reserved unto the Father. Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the messengers of heaven, but the Father only.

As we enter upon another year, it behoves us to look carefully before us. Failure in the fulfilment of *set* dates will cause disappointment and dismay. The simplicity of the teaching of the Spirit having been warped and entangled by the theories of man, there can nothing ensue but confusion and vexation of spirit. The words of the Apostle Paul will lose weight, wherein he says, the

day of Christ will not come *until* the Man of Sin be revealed, and the hindrance to his manifestation be taken away. Let us then be mindful of the words which have been spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. Knowing this, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming; for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as from the beginning of the creation. Then may the words of the Lord be verified, When the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?

The present apathy and lukewarmness of the disciples of Christ—the practical infidelity and disbelief in God's overruling providence of professing Christians—is gradually, but surely, making smooth the way for the manifestation of the antichrist. All churches, isms, and sects of the apostacy are but the rivers which gradually run into, and tend to the formation of, the sea of the final apostacy of this age against God and Christ.

Let the disciples, wherever situate, beware. The command still is, watch and pray. The hour of trial will soon be upon them again. The disciples must suffer ere they reign with Him. But though the waves tempestuously roar, and the earth be rocked to her foundations, yet to them the still small voice of their Master shall be heard amidst its din and confusion, "It is I, be not afraid." Though the body of Christ be at present broken and scattered, yet let its members struggle on, looking forward for his appearing, who hath said, despite of antichrists and the antichrist, "Fear not, little flock; it is your Father's good pleasure that you should have the kingdom."

## HYMN FOR THE EVENING.

*(Fourth Century).*

In the time of the evening,  
Let praise be given to Thee,  
From the united tongues,  
Of the children of men.

Thou hast given the day time,  
For business and labour,  
And that we may provide  
All useful things.

Behold, all who are oppressed  
With heavy toil,  
Return Thee their thanks,  
Because Thou dost give them repose.

Who is the being,  
That will not worship Thee,  
Because thou carest so much,  
For our humanity?

To the hungry and thirsty,  
To those who labour and are fatigued,  
The evening comes,  
And sets them at liberty.

The season of evening  
Hath now arrived,  
And maketh joyful  
The world and its labourers.

But he who is pitiless,  
Towards his fellows,  
And he who is avaricious,  
Not being satisfied with his work,

The evening despises him,  
And treats him with contempt,  
And his oppressive covetousness  
Is not satisfied.

Blessed be thy majesty,  
Who from the beginning,  
Hast carefully regarded,  
Our human nature.

Who hast appointed a returning  
To the children of men,  
And all living creatures  
In the time of the evening.

He hath put a seal upon his church,  
And defendeth her children  
From the adversary Satan,  
And all his hosts.

Let thy peace, Lord, be diffused,  
Through the four regions of the earth,  
And let the wicked one flee away  
From the midst of us.

From every tongue  
Of all animated creatures,  
And from all places,  
Let praise ascend.

And we, together with them,  
Will ascribe glory  
To thee, O Lord, and to the Father,  
For ever more.

*Ephraem Syrus.*

## Intelligence, Notes, &amp;c.

**BARROW IN FURNESS, LANCASHIRE.**—By an overlook last month, we neglected to notice the presence of a brother as a temporary resident in this place,—George Westgarth (with Mr John Barrow, Church Street.) Our brother is a stone-cutter, and has come from Geneva, Illinois, U.S. where his family presently resides. His stay in this country is not likely to be very long; but should any brother happen to be within reach, it might be well to give him a call, or if any have time to correspond with him to do so; for encouragement in the faith, and for fellowship in the glorious hope.

**MUMBLES and SWANSEA.** The brethren here have been favoured with a course of lectures by R. Roberts of Birmingham, extending from December 29th, to January

11th. It had been intended to have these lectures divided between Swansea and Mumbles, but as the place of meeting in Swansea could not be obtained during the week, the village of Mumbles came in for a double supply. The lectures were well attended, considering the amount of opposition in the place. On Sunday January 10th, brother Roberts gave three lectures in the brethren's meeting-room, in the Music Hall, Swansea. Twenty-six brethren and sisters from Mumbles (5 miles distant) met with those in Swansea for the breaking of bread at ten A.M. The attendance during the day was very good. On the evening of next day the brethren held a tea meeting in Mumbles; after tea the doors were thrown open, and an opportunity given to those present to put any questions

suggested by the previous lectures. Advantage was taken of this privilege by a Wesleyan local preacher, a very intelligent man, who put several inquires of a metaphysical nature, to which appropriate answers were given. What good may have been done to those outside is not yet known, but we hope to hear ere long of fruit to the glory of God. One effect these lectures seem to have had is to have stirred up the clergy to more active opposition to the truth, which, naturally may have more effect in calling the attention of the public to it, than any effort on our part.

**TURRIFF.**—"Dear brother, I spent my old Yule days with the brethren in Buchan. On the 7th January I baptized at Mintlaw, George Anderson, (tailor), New Deer, and met with the brethren at Fetter-Angus. And here on the 21st I baptized James Strachan, (farm servant), New Deer. Two or three in Buchan are inquiring. You will see by this programme what I am doing at home."—**J. R.**—Lectures on the Gospel of the great salvation to be obtained in the Kingdom of God at the second coming of the Lord. A Course of lectures will (D.V.) be delivered in the Town Hall, Turriff, on the following subjects by Mr James Robertson:—Sunday, January 21, "Paul's reason for not being ashamed of the Gospel;" January 28, "The mount of transfiguration;" February 4, "Peter's confession;" February 11, "The restitution of all things, and the renovation of the world;" February 18, "Christ consoling his apostles;" February 25, "The two thrones,"—Lectures to commence at half-past 5 o'clock, all are invited to attend. "Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh."

The Treasurer acknowledges receipts for the *Messenger* from Barnstaple, Dundee, Jarrow, Lanark, Malvern, Mumbles, Newburgh, and Swansea.

## Publications.

### THE DISCIPLES' CHORAL SERVICE OF BIBLE THEMES,

A collection of Christian Songs,—the subjects selected from the Holy Scriptures, and set to suitable music (in both notations), arranged for four voices. This book, got up expressly for the use of the brethren in their social services, and suitable either for the church or the fireside,

*Is now reduced in price.*

One Shilling in a neat printed cover; One and Sixpence cloth boards, post free. May be had of G. Dowie, 88 Nicolson Street, Edinburgh.

*Also may be had of G. Dowie,*

THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES,

First Series, for 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864; in single volumes, sewed, 1s.; or the four together, in cloth, lettered, 4s. 6d. The two first Nos. of the vol. for 1860 are out of print, but a few copies of the others are still on hand, and may be had at 1d. each. Postage in all cases extra—for single vols., 2d.; for the cloth vols., 6d.

As it is inconvenient to keep up stock so long, it is desired of those wishing to procure any back numbers or volumes of the Messenger, 1st series, to apply before April 1st, as at that time *the whole remainder will be disposed of some other way.*

The following may be had from W. NORRIS 9 Inghlston Street, Edinburgh.

THE DESTINY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE REVEALED IN THE SCRIPTURES. Price 6d.

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN PROTESTANTISM AND THE GOSPEL; 36 pp. 8vo, 6d.

WHAT IS THE GOSPEL? 4 pp. 12mo, 1s 6d per hundred.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD. 1 page, 8vo, 1s. per hundred.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS. 16 pp. 8vo, complete in 12 Nos. at 2d. each. Single Nos.

(except No. 5) may be had to complete sets. SAVING FAITH 20 pp. 8vo, 1d.

THE BIBLE. 8 pp. 12mo, 2s 6d per hundred.

THE MESSENGER IS REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

Articles should be sent in by the 15th of the month, and items of intelligence not later than the 24th; all papers meant for insertion, or notes of intelligence, may be forwarded to GEORGE DOWIE, 88 Nicolson Street; and all business communications to JAMES CAMERON, 12 Calton Hill, Edinburgh, to whom money orders should be made payable.

A. AND W. R. WILSON, PRINTERS, HIGH STREET, EDINBURGH.

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA;

Digital Archives Library; <https://coggc.org/>

# THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES.

“I SPEAK AS TO WISE MEN, JUDGE YE WHAT I SAY.”

No. 3.

MARCH 1, 1866.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II.

## JESUS CHRIST AND HIM CRUCIFIED.

WHEN Paul says to the called in Corinth, I determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified; he evidently intimates that the knowledge (and of course the faith) of these two things is essential to salvation. Let us, then, in the first place, ask what is the scriptural knowledge of Jesus Christ, and, in the second place, what is the knowledge of him crucified, according to the scriptures.

Jesus is the Christ. Christ is a name or title of office. It is a Greek word, which, being translated into English, is anointed. Thus, Jesus is called the Lord's Anointed in the second Psalm; that Psalm is quoted in Acts iv., he is called in the quotation the Lord's Christ. The Lord's Christ is the one that the Lord has anointed.

Of old, men were anointed to be prophets, priests, and kings. No man, no creature, and no thing, was ever anointed as anything else. From this it follows that Jesus is not, and cannot be, the Christ as anything else than as prophet, priest, or king. Thus you see that you have not the full knowledge of Jesus when you know him only as the Christ. Jesus is other things than

either prophet, priest, or king. Consequently he is other than the Christ. I will give you two examples of what I mean.

Jesus is the Word of God. John gives us the knowledge of Jesus as the Word of God in the following terms—"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." Now, Jesus being the Word is one thing, and his being the Christ is another. For he was not anointed to be the Word of God, or the Creator of the world.

Jesus is the Lamb of God who beareth away the sin of the world. As under the law, lambs without natural blemish or spot were offered up in sacrifice to God for the sins of the people, so Jesus, the holy spotless Lamb of God, in a moral point of view, loved us and gave himself a sacrifice, and an offering to God, for a sweet smelling savour. But Jesus being the Lamb of God is one thing, and his being the Christ is another. This will appear evident to you in a moment, if you only bear in mind that no lamb or any other creature

ever was anointed as a sacrifice. Sacrifices are not anointed to be sacrifices.

Do not Paul's words in 1 Cor. ii. 2, very clearly convey the idea that it is one thing to know Jesus Christ, and another thing to know him as crucified. He does not say (as the passage is sometimes misquoted), I determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ crucified, but he says, Jesus Christ and him crucified. Some translate the word *kai* into *even* Jesus Christ, even him that was crucified. This only makes my case all the stronger. It is as if Paul had said, I determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ, even that Jesus, who was crucified by Pontius Pilate. There were many christs that were not crucified by any one. But the Christ I determined and still determine to know among you for your salvation, is that Christ Jesus who was crucified.

Now this is a point of great importance. It shows that you may have much Bible, and even saving, knowledge of Jesus, and all the while not know him as the Christ. You may know him as the Word of God who created the world, and as the Lamb of God who beareth away the sin of the world, and yet not know what he is as the Christ. Now, it is saving knowledge to know him as the Word, and as the Lamb of God. The Bible makes that certain beyond all rational dispute. But then the Bible makes it equally certain, that saving knowledge is also the knowledge of Jesus as the Christ. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." "If you believe not that I am he, you shall die in your sins." Jesus died for our sins. Hence Paul declares, as one of the first things of the gos-

pel, that "Christ died for our sins."

Come, then, let us learn from the holy Scriptures what Jesus is as the Christ. Since men were of old anointed of God to be prophets, priests, and kings, one would naturally think that Jesus is the Christ as the Lord's anointed Prophet, Priest, and King. But when we look into the Bible, carefully as we ought to do, we find that no man was ever called Christ, or the Christ, or the Lord's Christ, or his Christ, or my Christ, as a prophet or as a priest, but only as a king. Some people indeed suppose that Ps. cv. 14, 15, is an exception to this rule. When Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were wanderers from nation to nation, "he suffered no man to do them wrong, saying, Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm." But this may mean, Touch not my kings, and do my prophets no harm. For as kings then went, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were mighty kings in the land. You may remember how Abraham armed his people and defeated the kings who took Lot captive. Besides Jesus was called the Christ before he was anointed. So might Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, be called by God mine anointed, with reference to that time when all nations shall be blessed in them. Thus he reproveth kings for their sakes, saying, Touch not my kings. What are the kings of the earth compared to the kings of the kingdom of heaven.

Now, when this Ps. cv. 14, 15, is so easily and naturally susceptible of being explained in that way, it follows that it can be to no rational man a satisfactory proof, that of men being called of God mine anointed as prophets.

In the whole Bible then, there is not a single place, where you can

say with certainty, Here men are called Christ, or the Lord's Christ, or my Christ, as a prophet, or as a priest.

But many are the scriptures in which men are so called as kings. Thus, Saul was anointed by Samuel to be king of God's people Israel; and as such, he is called the Lord's Christ, or the Lord's anointed, in 1 Sam. xii. 1-5. Samuel was both a prophet and a priest, yet he speaks of Saul as the only Lord's anointed then present. David also is called the Lord's Christ. And so is Cyrus, king of Persia, as a king raised up of God for the salvation of Israel.

And now let us come to Jesus himself. How is he called the Christ, or the Lord's Christ, in the holy Scriptures? Is he ever called the Christ, or the Lord's Christ, or Anointed, as a prophet, or as a priest? No, never once in the whole Bible.

No man has ever dared to say that there is a single place in the Bible where Jesus is called the Christ as a priest.

But some point us to Is. lxi. 1, as quoted too in Luke iv. 18, and again referred to in Acts x. 38, as a proof that Jesus is called the Christ as a prophet. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me; for he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor." Well, and also to open the prison doors, to give sight to the blind, feet to the lame, hearing to the deaf, and life to the dead. All this he does as the Christ. But this you will observe is being more than a prophet. The spirit of the Lord was upon Jesus, he was anointed to preach the gospel to the poor. He was also, by the same anointing, qualified to raise the dead. Here, therefore, Jesus is said to be the Anointed of the Lord, as more than a prophet. In fact, he was anointed to

relieve men out of all their miseries. That is why he is anointed. Now, death is one evil, and poverty is another, the latter sometimes more than the former. Well, Christ was christed to raise the dead, and to comfort the poor with the gospel; with those words of the eternal life to which Peter refers as a poor man, in John vi. 6-8. Lord to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. (In thy words we poor men only find comfort). And we believe (therefore), and are sure, that thou art that Christ the Son of the living God.

Here it is you see. As a good shepherd carries his lamb of his flock in his bosom, and gently leads those who are with young, so "Christ, the king of Israel," cared for the poor of his flock, preaching the gospel to them for their comfort, being made "Christ, the King of Israel," for this very end.

This is what the Bible calls Jesus as the Christ—a king; and as nothing else. There is not a place in all the Bible where Jesus is called the Christ as anything else than a king. In many places he is called the Christ as a king. In not one place as anything else. This is the truth, whatever you may make of Is. lxi., Luke iv. 18, and Acts x. 38. Jesus is not called the Christ in these places. And no one denies that he was both a prophet and a priest. The question is not whether Jesus be an anointed prophet and priest, but whether he is ever called the Christ as such. I say no; if you say yes, down with your proof.

1 Sam. ii. 10, is the first scripture where Jesus is called the Christ of the Lord, or his Anointed. Here Jesus is called his Anointed, which is the same as his Christ, neither as prophet, nor priest, but as king. "The enemies of the Lord shall be

broken in pieces, out of heaven shall he thunder upon them; the Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength to his king, and shall exalt the horn of his anointed." How excellent is this scripture when you look at it in the light of other scriptures, comparing spiritual things with spiritual things, that is the things of one scripture with the things in another. The enemies of the Lord shall be broken in pieces; so in the second Psalm, Thou shalt break them in pieces as a potter's vessel. Out of heaven shall he thunder upon them. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh at them; then shall he speak to them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; and he shall give strength to his king, and shall exalt the horn of his Christ. That is, yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion—ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession.

Jesus anointed to be God's king over his people Israel, and at the same time, over all nations on Mount Zion; that is the only view which you have of Jesus as the Christ in the whole Bible. I come now to show you that this is the view, and the only view, given of Jesus as the Christ in the Christian scripture, from the beginning of Matthew to the end of Revelations.

"The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." These are the first words of what is called the New Testament Scriptures. They present Jesus the Christ to us as the son of David, and of Abraham. And what is he as the son of David? The king of Israel. David's son is David's heir. And what is he as

the son of Abraham? King of all nations. Abraham and his seed are heirs of the world. In Abraham, and in his seed, all nations of the earth shall be blessed; and Israel itself in the seed of David. This is the view we got of Jesus as the Christ in the ancient scriptures. This is the view we got of him in these more modern scriptures. In all the Bible you will find no other view of Jesus as the Christ than this, and this everywhere.

Look now at Matt. ii, 1-6.—The wise men led of heaven came to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he who is born king of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. They were led of God to worship Jesus as king of the Jews. All who are led of God to Jesus, are so led, led to this end, led to worship him as king of the Jews.

Then Herod gathered together the chief priests and scribes of the people, and demanded of them where Christ should be born. Not where the king of the Jews should be born. But where Christ should be born. Herod was wiser than many a so-called gospel minister. He knew that the Christ was king of the Jews. And so did the priests and scribes. They told him that, according to the prophet, the Ruler of God's people Israel, the kingly Ruler must be born in Bethlehem.

Thus, you see, on all hands it is admitted that Jesus as the Christ is king of the Jews. Friends and foes in these days alike acknowledge this. But I begin to think I may weary the reader with too many proofs. I will therefore take you at once to the truth as confessed by Jesus himself. The great dispute between Jesus and the Jews was, as all the world knows, whether he was the Christ or not. Now did Jesus claim to be the king

of the Jews? Was that the thing he insisted upon in the face of opposition. And did they refuse him as their king. Was that the thing they denied in the face of his testimony. This is exactly how the matter stands in the New Testament. Jesus said to the Jews, I am your anointed King. They said, we will not have this man to reign over us.

Look how this controversy came to its end. At length they get hold of Jesus and drag him before the Sanhedrim. The chief priest asks him, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am; and ye shall see (me as) the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Observe, now, that to see Jesus as the Christ is to see him as the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. How does this agree with the view that he, as the Christ, is the king of Israel? Just to a T. He comes as the Son of man to reign over all peoples, nations, and languages, including the Jews, in the midst of the Jews on Mount Zion, in the land of Judah. Here is the proof, Zech. xi. 10-13, "Sing and rejoice, O, daughter of Zion; for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord. And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people; and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee. And the Lord

shall inherit Judah his portion in the holy land, and shall yet choose Jerusalem again," &c. This is what the Jews would understand Jesus to mean in his confession of being the Christ and Son of the blessed before the high priest.

Accordingly, they bound him in chains, and delivered him to Pilate, the Roman governor, with the accusation that he made himself King of the Jews. Then Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? and Jesus answered him, Thou sayest it. That is, I am King of the Jews.

This was the good confession he made before Pontius Pilate. To fight for this is to fight the good fight of faith, and so to lay hold on eternal life. Jesus fought this battle to the death. He loved not his life unto the death, testifying that he was Christ, the King of the Jews. So they crucified him on that confession; and wrote his accusation on his cross, This is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.

This brings to "him crucified." We have seen why Jesus is called the Christ, what it is to believe in him as the Christ, that he is as such the King of the Jews, and that to know and believe this is essential to salvation. Now, let us see why he was crucified, what it is to believe in him as crucified, and whether that faith be not essential to salvation too.

D. L.

*(To be continued).*

### FRIENDLY GREETINGS ACROSS THE SEA.

It has been suggested that it might do good to afford a wider publicity to the following letters, than was intended when they were written, and we therefore insert them here. No. 1 is the reply of the Edinburgh brethren to the Rochester epistle; No. 2, some portions of a rejoinder from the church in Rochester. We trust that such brotherly communication will not be rare among those who are of like precious faith.



No. 1.

Edinburgh, 1st November 1865.

To the church in Rochester, N. Y., their brethren in the faith residing in Edinburgh and neighbourhood. and meeting in Union Hall, 98 South Bridge, send greeting—

BELOVED,—It has given us much pleasure to receive your circular letter. Not only because it indicated the interest which you feel in us, as a church of the living God, but because of the excellent spirit which pervades it all.

We very cordially reciprocate those holy and godlike sentiments which you have grouped together from the word of truth, and feel confident that the spirit of these is in your hearts, else there would have been no prompting to the trouble of writing so long a letter to those whose faces you have not seen in the flesh.

But, brethren, though we are strangers to one another, as men reckon acquaintanceship, yet we are very familiar with you in the sight of, and in relation to, God. Are you not our brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus. Dear, and your likeness is before us when we look on one another, as surely as if we possessed your several picture portraits.

Had we ourselves sat down to write you, this is the style in which our feelings and utterances would have flowed, even as you have expressed yourselves, so that our sympathies are quite with you, brethren. Love, unity, peace, and purity appear to us a very excellent summary of virtues to stir up and cultivate in each other. These we have made it our study to abound in, and have often had cause to thank God for the spontaneous growth of those fruits of the Spirit, which, under the stimulation of the truth, and the fostering care of faithful brethren in the Lord, has sprung up among us.

Yet, alas, we are not perfect, for there have been strife and division, and their concomitant evils amongst us, and we have hardly yet outlived the bane of a very sad disruption which took place upwards of three years ago. In calmly reviewing which, and its results, we have become more satisfied than ever that while knowledge—boasted and much exalted knowledge—*puffs up*, *puffs up* indeed for one against another, as you have so aptly quoted; *love*—that self-denying, generous, godlike spirit, which made the early disciples so good and of such good report, most naturally and efficiently *builds up*.

Speaking so, we do not disparage the knowledge and wisdom which are of God, for without them we are nothing, and our constant occupation, as it is our constant study, is to increase our acquaintance with the lively oracles of God, that by the knowledge of them

we might be strengthened and guided in the way of life. O, brethren, what a boon is this which our Heavenly Father has given us, even the knowledge of his own will and purpose revealed in his word. This study adds, from time to time another stone to the building of our character; but the development of love alone can make these grow into each other like living stones: so that being knit together by love, we are of that fine and admirable texture which is after the pattern of Jesus Christ.

As it may be interesting to you to know our fashions, if not our features; and to be aware of our aggregate character and working, although strangers to us individually, we have much pleasure in noting these few items:—

We have now lived together in brotherhood for twelve years, and some of those who formed the church at its first start, take an active part and lively interest in it still. We meet twice every first day of the week for worship, mutual edification, and commemoration. During the winter months we always have a course of lectures, in the way of setting forth the faith. These tend not only to inform the people of our peculiarities, but also to stimulate ourselves to holding on to the word of life. Our ordinary meetings are conducted without any chairman, the acts of worship and service being, for the most part, quite spontaneous. Our number at present is fifty-six, and an occasional addition from the ranks of the enemy gives us heartening; but our great strength is firm faith in the plain words of God. Speculative interpretation is at a discount with us, and we rather seek to excel in the iteration of those reasonings and demonstrations of the Lord and his apostles contained in the scriptures—to repose with perfect assurance on the very sure word of prophecy, and to render into living form those gracious words of doctrine and duty with which the Bible abounds.

Our *hope* is in the fulfilment of those promises made to Eve, to Abraham, and to David, which all concentrate in Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, the Son of God, who is now at his Father's right hand, biding his time to establish the kingdom under the whole heaven, and give reward to all his saints and faithful brethren, making them kings and priests unto God. For the coming of the Lord to fashion us into his own image, we are constantly looking, waiting, and watching: hoping to be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless. These things of the kingdom of God, and name of Jesus the Christ, have all along constituted essential elements of our *faith*, having which we were baptized into the name of this seed of Abraham, and son of David, in order to

the remission of sins, and inheritance of eternal life in the kingdom of God.

To help us in our acquaintances with each other, to consider one another, to provoke unto love and good works, we give attention to the amenities of social life, and thus know each other well. Our mid-week evening meeting is regularly held in the house of one or other of the brethren, and generally well attended—the mutual interest we feel constraining us to assemble, as much as the interchange of thought and feeling for which it affords scope.

Thus we live like a family—a family, however, away from home, whose sympathies are more within its own bosom, and its desires for the appearing of the Head and Chief of all, the Lord Jesus Christ, our elder Brother, Priest, and Lord—praying with all fervour, Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.

It will give us much pleasure to hear from you again and we shall give good heed to your excellent counsels, for they are the divine admonitions: and shall count it a pleasure and an honour to be brethren of the faithful in Christ Jesus, which are at Rochester. Farewell.—Yours in the hope of the kingdom of God,

For the church, G. DOWIE, *Sec.*

No. 2.

To the Church of God in Edinburgh, Scotland. Their brethren in the faith once delivered to the saints, residing in the city of Rochester, New York, America, send greeting—

DEARLY BELOVED,—With much pleasure your reciprocal letter of love, bearing date of November 1st, in due time has reached us across the great deep, and was received by the church with joyful acceptance, not only because you have condescended in the spirit of love to reciprocate your tender regards in christian charity towards us (a church of the living God), but, also, because of your very cordial reception and warm sympathy in unison with those holy principles so endearingly portrayed in the lively oracles, and which we ourselves hitherto have, as an organized little body of Messiah's brethren, acknowledging no head or superior but Jesus; ever remembering his words—call no man master, for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren; and he that is chiefest among you, let him be servant of all. We are willing to read all, and hear all, but yield not ourselves to any man, or class of men's opinions or speculations—they are at a heavy discount with us, as with you.

We very cordially reciprocate your love and fraternal fellowship in our Lord Jesus Christ, rejoicing in the one hope of our calling with

you. Although unknown in the flesh, and far distant from you all, yet we feel as if present with you in spirit, joying and beholding your order, actuating us as a stimulant to provoke to love and to good works. . . .

Our object in writing to brethren everywhere, was because we mourned in heart to see and know the sad mangling of the body of Christ, by the distractions, divisions, and strifes abounding among brethren, which we, as a body, stand aloof entirely from, except to mourn over it. There is a gangrenous sore somewhere, and we see both parties at fault, and grievously too, and we had no intention to urge that this sore should be smoothed over and externally healed, and still fester within; but rather find counsel from the lively oracles how to settle such difficulties, and crucify the old man of the flesh. It really seems to us there are more than one Diotrefes in these last-days, who seeks to have the pre-eminence. The apostle John had to rebuke one in his day—O, that an apostle were here now to exercise authority, and put certain men in their proper places, discussions would then cease. . .

We are much gratified in learning your aggregate character, your ordinary meetings, your acts of worship, your breaking of bread, your mid-week meetings, your lecturing for the good of others, and, lastly, your aggregate numbers.

And would now iterate again in return—are you not our brothers and sisters in the Lord? echo answers with bowels of mercy, *Yes.* It may somewhat interest you to know our manners, habits, and aggregate character; our numbers are comparatively small (in a city of sixty thousand souls, and generally a church-going people), yet, from all that aggregation, only fifteen have dared to come out on the Lord's side, who like the Samaritans (Acts viii. 12), have believed the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus the Christ, and have been immersed, both men and women. We are, and live as one family, realising we are children of our Father in heaven, who careth for us. Our feelings and sympathies one, knowing each other well. We meet for worship, and edifying each other, twice every first-day of the week, in a school-room, central in our city, for hire only on first-day. At 10-30 a.m. we meet to study and investigate the scriptures (very beneficial), one of us in the chair, to whom we look up to for order, &c. We have a small library, consisting of a Greek-Septuagint Old Testament, a Greek New Testament, and Lexicon, Cruden's Concordance unabridged, and a few ancient and modern history volumes. Again we meet at 2 p.m. After one of us chooses a Psalm of David, and reading it as in

the Old Testament, we chaunt it, all of us joining in sweet anthems of praise with great delight. The presiding brother asks if any brother has in his mind a portion of scripture to read; any one does so, after which, we join in prayer for divine blessing. The presiding brother having selected a portion of scripture, occupying from half-an-hour to an hour, as may be, as a leading lecture, leaves space for other brothers to make remarks. We are seldom without some from without in this former part of our meeting; we now announce this part of our meeting is closed, strangers now retire. We then draw near, and sit around the table, which is now covered as a family board, with the sacred emblems, consisting of unleavened bread and wine, for which we thank the Father of Jesus, and our Father—our presiding brother breaks and gives to the brother or sister next him, from one to another all round, partaken by our presiding brother last. In the same manner we take the cup, and thus this little portion of our Father's family commemorate the dying love of him who freely gave his life for us; after which, without further ceremony, we chaunt an appropriate psalm of David, the sweet singer of Israel; and return home. We call on each other as brothers and sisters, as we have time and opportunity through the week,

living all in different parts of our city; and our winters cold and often stormy; in summer we think of meeting in each other's houses, for our elevation, as we are pretty much isolated from the world. We may say unknown, yet well known. . . . .

We are in full hopes and joyful expectation of the promises made to the fathers of Israel, that the kingdom will be restored to the twelve tribes in their own land. The archives, and heirship of the nationality and throne of David are all centred in Jesus, the Son of David, and the Son of God, believing there will be a resurrection from among dead ones, who shall be glorified and fashioned like him to subdue and reign over the nations with him.

We will be much gratified and pleased to hear from you again; your letter of affection, and love, and intelligence, has comforted us, so that our hearts are glad. We ever shall think ourselves honoured to be counted brethren of the faithful in the anointed Jesus, composing the church of God in Edinburgh. Farewell.

Yours in hope and in waiting for the Messiah of Israel,

For the church, JAMES M'MILLAN.  
Rochester, Monroe Co., N. Y.,  
North America, 26th January 1866.

## WHAT IS LITERALISM?

A few weeks ago a zealous revivalist, after trying to teach us his spiritism, prayed that we might "be led to see that the written word *was only symbols*, needing the Holy Spirit to give it *meaning* and life." We audibly dissented, for our previous argument was upon the principle enunciated by our greatest authority—"The *words* which I speak to you—they are spirit and they are life."

The same day we had a discussion with a minister, whose basis of reasoning in defence of the immortality of the soul was, that the Bible did not mean what it said, and who boldly confessed that he did not need the Bible to teach him what man was.

Not long afterwards we heard

another minister advocate the absolute necessity of children studying the Shorter Catechism to enable them to understand the Bible. This is but another way of expressing the general idea "that the Bible is a dark book," or in that man's words, "an advanced treatise needing human manuals to explain it." The logical consequence is—the need of a clergy or teaching class. "The minister is the human guardian and expositor of Scripture . . . . In studying the Bible, the way of duty is the way of danger; there is no such forlorn and miserable journey as that of a young man's travels on this track without a guide . . . . The minister, *be he whom he may*, was sent for this, among other purposes, to give directions, in all things

pertaining to the Bible.\* Hence the Reformed Presbyterian Church affirms—"The charge and office of interpreting the Holy Scripture is a part of the Ministerial calling which none, however otherwise qualified, should take upon him . . . but he that is duly called thereunto by God and *his Kirk*."

The foregoing reminiscences are given on account of sundry letters, &c., received anent the article in *Messenger* for December last—"The first and last curse." One esteemed brother writes, "You seem to be drifting to the extreme of literalism.—Literal progeny of the serpent! dear me, what next?" A second accounts the same "as directly antagonistic to the Gospel," &c. Another, (not, however, writing on the article), advises us "not to look at all objects through the oblique lens of literalism if we wish to view them in their true light and just proportion." One who believes that what the prophets have foretold will come to pass, as however improbable things seem now—such as the restoration of Israel, the triumph of the king of the north, the establishment of the Kingdom of Christ on the earth, &c.—yet objects to other and contextual testimonies of the restoration of the physical creation, the New Heavens and Earth, and the like, as being "far away from all region of *likelihood*;" (seemingly unaware that the true region of likelihood is secularism, Acts xxvi. 8); and all because it is "absurd literalism."

From these we are led to conclude that there is some serious error yet blinding the eyes of the brotherhood, as well as the world, when the scriptures are viewed. For these, whilst energetically denouncing sectarian teachers as "blind leaders of the

blind," as "deceivers," &c., yet retain the premise of which *they* are the necessary consequence. For if the words of the Bible need interpreting, then there must be a *class of interpreters*. And as these can only interpret according to their mental proclivities, *sects* and *schisms* are inevitable. The only way to fight priestcraft of every type and guise,—Papal, Protestant, Brethrenistic—is to deny that the Bible needs interpreting at all: to oppose "I say," or "he says" with "*thus saith the Lord*." No other course is open, for if we quote or endorse one man's exposition, our antagonist has a perfect right to bring another commentator; and all human opinion and words are of equal authority—Origen, Pius, Luther, Calvin, Swedenborg, Wesley, or whomsoever is named. Gal. ii. 6.

The only freedom then is to be found in the *truth*, and the truth only in the *word*. "If ye continue in my *word*, ye are my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth will make you free." "Every *word* of God is pure." "The *words* of the Lord are pure *words*; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times." "Thy *word* is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it." "I have hoped in thy *word*." Can these expressions have any meaning or power to us, if they are not assurances of the reality of the *words* in which God utters His promises? If we receive an assurance from a friend, do we honour him when we believe he does not mean the thing he says? Does not our doubt and construction make him a liar? Only in *words* can truth be given. It follows, then, that we only believe God when we believe the *words* He uses. Or to express it in another phrase, we only believe His spoken word, the Bible, when we take its statements in their ordinary, natural, or obvious sense, just as we

\* London Quarterly Review, October 1862, Article, "Bible Classes."

should if they occurred in any other book. *This is literalism.\**

Literalism, then, is neither more nor less than just the foundation of our faith—that God means what he says. On it we have built up the hopes we have. Thus—

God promised to give to Abraham and his seed the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and to bless all nations through him and his seed. We have believed that God meant this, and “have hoped in His word” for a share with Abraham in this estate. If the principle is unsound, and God meant something else, *then our eternal prospects are wrecked*, for we have *denied the interpretation*,—that he meant an inheritance of a Canaan beyond the skies.

We have literally read that God made man of dust, and that he returns

to dust again in death. If He did not mean this by the words His scribes used, then “we are of all men the most miserable,” for we have found it impossible to believe the exposition—that this is true only of the husk, the body, and that God means that the soul—the real man—lives for ever. We have fallen into an error, of expecting eternal life only through resurrection, if it be so that the Bible does not mean what it says.

We have *literally* read that Israel were dispersed throughout all nations. But then we don't know that it was so, if the *words* don't mean what they say. Symbolism is as powerful with history as prophecy, and we must needs fall back on the expositions we remember glancing at nigh twenty years ago, that Adam, Eve,\* Noah, Abraham, and Israel, were a series of symbols and allegories, not real personages.†

We have as literally read that God will gather Israel again into their own land, to make them the greatest nation on the face of the earth. But if there is a possibility of their God meaning something else than what He says, then we have hoped in vain, have prayed for them in vain, have loved Jerusalem for nought.

We have understood from Moses, the Prophets, Jesus, and the Apostles, that God would establish His Kingdom upon the earth, that His Son Jesus would be the King thereof, that he would reign in Jerusalem, and with His Saints over the earth,

\* One writer condemns the essence of our faith as “a pernicious literalism.” Our only answer to this charge is to quote from his own writings the following cogent passages.—“If the Scriptures are to be understood on some novel principle of *interpretation*, the information to this effect must exist somewhere. *It is not in the Bible itself*; if it were there would be an end to the question. Where then? How are we to deal with this “spiritual” mode of interpretation, then? Simply to set it aside, and ascertain from the Scriptures themselves how it is intended that we shall understand them. Take a prophecy, Lev. xxvi. 31—33. Pent. xxviii. 37. How has this been fulfilled? All admit that in fulfilment of this prediction the *real* Israel were driven from their *real, literal* land, which became *really* and *literally* desolate, and that Israel has been *really* and *literally* scattered among the *literal* nations of the earth . . . . All fulfilled prophecies came to pass exactly as the *terms* of the prediction, plainly and *literally* understood, would have led us to expect . . . . Now are we not here supplied with a rule for the understanding of unfulfilled prophecy. The spiritualizing rule is gratuitous . . . . It is not in the Scriptures . . . . Therefore we are shut up to the conclusion that it is a human invention—one of the lineaments in the countenance of that hideous apostasy which still frightens the world out of its judgment.

\* We have a dim idea of memory that the ordinary interpretation of the curse on the serpent in Gen. iii. 15, was the foundation of the whole structure.

† For those who are curious in such matters we would mention that Howitt's Journal, vol. 1, page 162, contains a scheme of interpretation of the Seals, Vials, &c., quite as reasonable, and far more comprehensive, than the usual run of such, for it begins with Adam

that the temple would be rebuilt, &c. But it is probable that we have all the while been believing a lie, if expositors are to be allowed the slightest credit to their showing of some other meaning.

We have believed that this Son of God and future King of the whole world was once before on the earth, that he died for our sins, and rose from the dead. But if "the *Revelation* of Jesus Christ . . . to his servant John, who bore record of the *word* of God," does not mean what it says, then there is every probability that the *Gospel* of the same author is likewise mystical, and the other three Gospels similarly uncertain. So that our faith *may be* vain, and we may be yet in our sins.

We may carry this *necessary connection betwixt faith and literalism* still further into details. For it is by details that we build up our faith, even as it is by stones that we build up our houses. And it follows that if one single portion be open to the suspicion of mystical or foreign meaning, others may be, and thus the whole comes under doubt. Thus—

If, when the Scriptures speak of Babylon, we are to affirm that Rome is meant, has not another equal right to say, that, when Israel is written, the church is meant, or that when Jerusalem is the subject, his sect is the object. Or, if when Assyria is mentioned, and we substitute the Roman empire, has not another as good ground for putting Britain into the text when Israel's pre-eminence is foretold. We were lately amused by an eccentric revivalist, (not the one before mentioned), asserting the whole Bible scenes and prophecies to have been enacted in, and relating to Scotland, which he said was formerly named Canaan or Palestine. The Scotch were the real Jews, who had murdered their Lord,

and like all other murderers, had denied their identity, and fixed it on some other race and place inhabiting the Mediterranean region. Jerusalem, where our Lord was crucified, he located on some Lanarkshire muirland. Like all other interpreters, geography, history, and other sciences were of no value against his ideas, he taking refuge in that much abused warning, 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21. Yet absurd as is this *en masse* translation of the Biblical theatre and subjects, is it worse than current transferences of Babylonian and Judean prophecies to Italy, France, Constantinople, Austria, &c.

Again, when we interpret the New Jerusalem into a symbol of the saints in their corporate manifestation, or four square multitudinous unity, say we anything better than he who explains Isa. liv. lx., Ez. xlvi. ; and all similar passages into the church ; or rather, do we not both say the self-same thing.

Does not consistency require that if we change *time* from a day into a year, that we must do so in all cases. Thus we ought to understand that Abraham's seed were afflicted in Egypt not 400, but 144,000 years ; that the Babylonian captivity lasted 25,200 years ; that the millenium is to be 360,000 years, and so forth. To magnify prophecies, *i. e.* *future historic time*, 360 times that of *past* history, is to destroy all proportion—is like putting a tall factory chimney to a small cabin.

We might carry this reasoning out to any length of details, for almost every passage of the Bible has been distorted by interpretations of one sort and another. But what need is there ? It must surely be self-evident to every honest mind, that the only possible kind of revelation from God to man is that of using plain natural language. A mystical Bible would

simply be a delusion, a trap, a Pandora's box. We are necessitated to come at the conclusion, that the only way to accept the Scriptures is in their plain, obvious, or literal meaning.

Literalism, then, is just taking the word of God to mean what it says, by accepting its words in their simple, natural significance. Applied to His promises, it is to believe He will do or give what He says, not something else. Applied to prophecy, it is to believe that events will happen just as He has foretold, not some other way according to so and so's "private interpretation." It is to believe that *future events will be just as literally fulfilled as past events have been.*

Before we proceed further we must make a definition. We have used the term *literalism* thus far in its conventional significance, as the antithesis of mystical or symbolical. In this sense, it is the equivalent of the *obvious, natural, or ordinary* meaning of the scripture words. Etymologically, it is *according to the letter*, and hence some have supposed that it leaves no room for simile, metaphor, figure, or symbol. This is a mistake, for a word conventionally used has conventional amplitude. But the word, whether used etymologically or conventionally, recognises all these. For as we have so far found the Bible uses no unexplained symbol; and an explained one comes into the class of plain, obvious words. By this means the authorised explanation, in supplying the literal idea to the form, reduces the symbol, or hieroglyph, to the nature of a colouring, or garniture to the real. And the metaphors, comparisons, &c., being always self-evident, occupy in Scripture, as in all other works, the office of polish and ornament, by means of which the real is heightened, not concealed.

If any figure or symbol is not *according to the letter* or rule of the combined sciences of grammar and rhetoric, it is false.

*Literalism* is the God-honouring acceptance of His words. The supposition that a "style of language peculiarly *deep, mysterious, spiritual,*" was necessary for revelation, so that men would not be able to understand it, cannot be honouring God. The idea that he must thus conceal his meaning, lest men, being warned, should not do what he had foretold, is just to accuse him of *setting a trap to catch men into sinning.* But it is not so with Him. He has always warned in the plainest and fullest language, Lev. xxvi.; Deut. xxviii. xxx. If the results be such as shown in Jer. vi. 8-17, or John ix. 39-41, xv. 22-24, the guilt is wholly men's own. For if they have not sinned openly and defiantly against the word like Jehoiakim (Jer. xxvi.), they have sinned in preferring the darkness of Rabbinical interpretations to the light of plain shining words.

One of the most telling passages in the gospels is Luke xviii. 31-34, which shows that the plainest spoken predictions are the least understood. From this cause it is that Daniel and the Apocalypse are to this day stumbling blocks to expositors, and that most men will blindly misunderstand them, till it be too late, to derive warning from them. A famous diplomatist, Talleyrand, said, "words were given to men to conceal their thoughts." But it is recorded of a certain British ambassador that he successfully thwarted the designs of a court who made that saying their basis of action, by simply speaking the plain truth. In this he did but imitate his Maker.

*Literalism* is the only satisfactory, mind-filling, heart-warming mode of

receiving the words of God. In John xiv. 1-3, we have great consolation given: but if we begin to doubt that the Lord means what he says, then our comfort vanishes, and we are tossed from wave to wave. The sublimity of literalism's power is shown in the record of the fathers, "Having seen the promises afar off they were *persuaded* of them, and *embraced* them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims in the land." But how would it have been if they had doubted but that God did not mean something else than He promised? But they believed the record that God gave, and hence it would be, to them as to us, a cause of "rejoicing with *joy unspeakable*, and full of glory," "a *lively hope*," "a *blessed hope*." Whence would the Thessalonians have got comfort if they had taken Paul's words, 1 Eph. iv. 13-18, as having any meaning, but just what he said. Had they believed with some interpreters of their day, that the resurrection was past already; or, that the dead were alive; or, that the Lord would descend silently into some desert place, that they would hear some whisper to set off on travel to find him; that by "clouds," Paul meant the crowd whom they would find at the place of meeting, that this meeting-place—"the air"—was the political aerial; had they conceived these and other alterations, would not the strife of mental debate have destroyed their power to "comfort one another with *these words*."

*Literalism is the only safe-guard* alike against priestly pretention and infidel deadliness. It proves that "the words of the Lord being pure

words," are able to make *wise* to salvation, and *free* by the truth. Even were *interpretation* always used by honest hands, it is essentially weak and bad. For were the meaning of scripture dependent on anything but the natural sense of the words, we should never reach a meaning at all:—

"For each man's mind is a different prism,  
With angles of thought, with stains of sin,  
Which breaks up the sound rays as they  
pass in,  
Into this, and that, into curse or chrisim,  
Joy or regret."

The fact that each man's phrenological organs, in their multiple relationships with each other, allow several millions of variations, renders it hopeless to expect identity of thought apart from plain words. Hence we find the same individual so often denying to-day what he wrote yesterday, and censuring others for holding his late interpretation, instead of his later or latest.

*Literalism, then, is to accept Bible ideas in Bible words.* And is exemplified in believing that man is constitutionally dust and ashes; that the hope of life is contained in certain tangible promises made to the fathers; that it will be given through a resurrection from the dead; that it will be enjoyed in a kingdom of Christ upon the earth, over all Israel and rebuilt Jerusalem; afterward to be eternalised in new heavens and a new earth, and with the heaven-built city of new Jerusalem as the abode of God, thereby realising the highest form and nature of blessing, "God all in all."

J. W.



TRANSLATIONS OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS, OR  
HEPTADES PROPHECY.

*From the Hebrew.*

DANIEL ix. 24-27.

By JOHN BELLAMY. London, 1863.  
Translation of the Book of Daniel.

SEVENTY weeks are determined upon thy people and thy holy city, to finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, also to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and the prophecy; and to anoint the most holy.

Know, therefore, for thou shalt understand, from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to rebuild Jerusalem, to Messiah the Prince, will be seven weeks and sixty and two weeks: then the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times.

And after sixty and two weeks, Messiah will be cut off, but not for himself: and the people of the prince that will come, will destroy the city and the sanctuary, but his end will be with a flood even to the end of the war, desolations are determined.

And he will confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he will cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, and by the overspreading of abominations, it will be a desolation even till the consummation, and that be determined upon the desolate.

By ISAAC LEESER. London, 5625, Philadelphia, 5616. Translation of the Twenty-four Books of the Holy Scriptures.

SEVENTY weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to close up the transgressions, and to make an end of sins, and to atone for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy thing.

Know, therefore, and comprehend, that from the going forth of the word to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed the prince will be seven weeks: and during sixty and two weeks will it be again built with streets and ditches (around it), even in the pressure of the times.

And after the sixty and two weeks will an anointed one be cut off without a successor to follow him: and the city and the sanctuary will the people of the prince that is coming destroy; but his end will come in a violent overthrow; but until the end of the war, devastations are decreed (against it).

And he will make a strong covenant with the many for one week; and in the half of the week will he cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and this because of the prevalence of the abominations which bringeth devastation, and until destruction and what is decreed shall be poured out upon the waster.

## A WORD OF CRITICISM.

TO THE EDITORS.

DEAR BRETHREN—In last month's "Messenger" I notice a reply to the Rochester address. It is, generally speaking, a very good and brotherly reciprocation of affectionate solicitude. Some of it I do not quite understand, but there is one passage which I wish to express my dissent from, because I think it is not in keeping with the spirit of the Rochester letter, nor our duty, as sensible Christians, who ought to be above any petty jealousies upon matters which do not rise to the level of the one faith. The objectionable passage occurs in page 21, and reads—"with parties who assume names not to be found sanctioned by use of the apostles, or their hearers, the disciple of Christ can have no fellowship."

Now, with deference to the judgment of

the brethren at Birmingham, I think that were we to admit that considerations like this, in themselves, forbid fellowship, where might we stop? It seems to me altogether immaterial whether or not a man prefers to call himself a "christadelphian," "antipas," c. c. c. (constituent of the church of Christ), a member of "the royal association of believers," &c., &c. The vital question I submit is, Does he believe and obey the gospel of the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus the Christ? If he does so truly, any pedantic or fanciful designation he may adopt will not surely blot out his name from God's book of life. And neither should it move us, who are God's children, to cast him from us.—I am, &c.

M.

## THE INQUIRER.

I wish to ask the solution of an apparently very difficult subject, of any of the brethren who may think themselves competent to the task. We sometimes hear it asserted, that this and the other thing "subverts the faith." For instance, to call in question what is commonly known as "the year day theory," as a rule in the understanding of prophecy; to suppose that a personal adversary or devil, is sometimes alluded to in scripture; or to think that the "fervent heat," mentioned in 2 Pet. iii., is not to be taken figuratively,

&c. I do not myself assert that such things so viewed, will subvert, or overturn the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and name of Jesus Christ. Will any one who does so (since the matter is of considerable importance to him), take the trouble to demonstrate scripturally and logically, that the faith is overturned by the holding of such opinions, or of any one of them. The assertion has frequently been made, but never attempted to be proven, so far as I am aware.

SERGIUS PAULUS.

## Intelligence, Notes, &amp;c.

EDINBURGH.—Mrs Henderson, a very old woman, who has been resident in London for ten years, and known to some of the brethren there, has returned to Edinburgh. The first thing she has done, after resting from the fatigues of the journey, is to make the good confession and be baptized into the name of the Lord: thus correcting years of wrong standing in relation to God, and securing her title to the Kingdom of God. She is now numbered with the faithful in Edinburgh, and purposes to spend the remainder of her days there, in the patient waiting for Christ. The brethren also receive accession in the person

of Alexander Black, bookbinder (son of our brother and sister Black of Aberdeen), who, upon February 27th, made the good confession, and was baptized into Christ.

CROSSGATES.—On Monday, 12th February, John Cunningham, miner, Cowdenbeath, having made a clear and intelligent confession of his faith, was immersed into the name of the Lord. This took place at Edinburgh, and he forthwith returned to his own place, rejoicing in hope of the glory of God. The very small church here finds itself much strengthened by such an acquisition. He has been for some time a leading member of

"The Reformation," and now transfers his energies and abilities to a more apostolic cause.

**JARROW ON-TYNE.**—The small company of believers in this place has been enriched by the fellowship of brother and sister George Davidson, from Aberdeen, who have come to reside in this quarter. Peace be with them!

**KIRKCALDY.**—The series of lectures already noticed as having been delivered here, in November and December, has been supplemented by another one in January, and by two public conferences with those who have been interested in the weighty matters brought under their notice for the first time. The second conference with them, being by their own request, indicates an anxiety to thoroughly comprehend the doctrine of The Kingdom which has been set forth. There are but few brethren in that locality, two in Burntisland, and one in Kirkcaldy—we hope their number will be augmented ere long, by some of those who have had ears to hear, and who, we trust, have also hearts to obey.

**MUMBLES.**—On Sunday, the 18th February, Mrs Rachel Delve and Helen Hayward (a sister of Mrs Clement), were immersed into the name of the Lord, and received into fellowship. At the same time and place, Mr Evans, Swansea, put on the Lord Jesus. He is added to the church at Swansea. The opposition of the clergy, to which we referred in last month's report from this place, took the form of a public defence of "The immortality and immateriality of the soul, and consequent conscious existence of the dead," in a course of seven lectures by Mr D. Evans, student from the Baptist College, Pontypool. The chair was, with one or two exceptions, filled by a clergyman belonging to some of the neighbouring churches. Our brethren were denied the privilege of putting questions at the close of each lecture; but this defect has been to some extent supplied by a course of three lectures by our brother, D. Clement, in which he reviewed the positions of Mr Evans, and stated and defended the doctrine of Scripture regarding the mor-

tality of man, and his absolute dependence for eternal life on faith in the Christ Jesus. A good deal of excitement has been caused, which we hope shall lead many to search the scriptures, and believe the truth.

On and after May 25th, the address of G. DOWIE will be as formerly, 12 Beaumont Place.

The Treasurer acknowledges receipts for the *Messenger* from Birmingham, Dundee, Dunkeld, and London.

### THE DISCIPLES' CHORAL SERVICE OF BIBLE THEMES,

A collection of Christian Songs,—the subjects selected from the Holy Scriptures, and set to suitable music (in both notations), arranged for four voices. This book, got up expressly for the use of the brethren in their social services, and suitable either for the church or the fireside,

*Is now reduced in price.*

One Shilling in a neat printed cover; One and Sixpence cloth boards, post free. May be had of G. Dowie, 88 Nicolson Street, Edinburgh.

*Also may be had of G. DOWIE,*

#### THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES,

First Series, for 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864; in single volumes, sewed, 1s.; or the four together, in cloth, lettered, 4s. 6d. The two first Nos. of the vol. for 1860 are out of print, but a few copies of the others are still on hand, and may be had at 1d. each. Postage in all cases extra—for single vols., 2d.; for the cloth vols., 6d.

As it is inconvenient to keep up stock so long, it is desired of those wishing to procure any back numbers or volumes of the *Messenger*, 1st series, to apply before April 1st, as at that time *the whole remainder will be disposed of some other way.*

THE MESSENGER IS REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

Articles should be sent in by the 15th of the month, and items of intelligence not later than the 24th; all papers meant for insertion, or notes of intelligence, may be forwarded to GEORGE DOWIE, 88 Nicolson Street; and all business communications to JAMES CAMERON, 12 Calton Hill, Edinburgh, to whom money orders should be made payable.

A. AND W. R. WILSON, PRINTERS, HIGH STREET, EDINBURGH.

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA;  
Digital Archives Library; <https://coggc.org/>

# THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES.

" I SPEAK AS TO WISE MEN, JUDGE YE WHAT I SAY."

No. 4.

APRIL 1, 1866.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN RELATION TO PROPHECY.

THE historical books of the Old Testament not only form a great and imposing panorama of the events of the past, and the special dealings of God with his people Israel, and with the nations of the earth; but in many particulars they serve another high and important purpose, namely, to display in definite terms the course which God will adopt in the future in the accomplishment of his great designs. There is reason to believe that a written language was not extensively employed during the patriarchal, and even in later times of the Jewish history. The materials which were then in use upon which to write, needed considerable preparation. The skins of animals must go through a process, in order to render them fit for receiving any record. The papyrus which was sometimes used was a somewhat frail and perishable material, and the process of engraving upon stone, would not only be a very slow one, but would moreover be exceedingly inconvenient if transmission or circulation among the people were necessary. It is not therefore very probable that the revelations of God to men in those times

were learned from written documents. The Scriptures teach us that there was another means by which the future purposes of God were displayed before the eyes of Israel. The actions and events in this people's history, as well as other facts recorded in the Bible, were constituted the types or prophetic signs, of greater and more important transactions which will be enacted on a grander and more imposing scale in a future age. We will consequently take the admonition of the prophet and turn our attention to, and "remember the former things of old."

In the fourteenth chapter of the book of Exodus, we read an account of the passage of the Israelites through the depths of the Red Sea, and we should certainly be inclined to regard this as purely historic, relating a miraculous circumstance which has long since passed away: that it is simply a narrative of a remarkable deliverance effected by the God of Israel, in proof of his favour and love towards that people, without supposing it to have the slightest reference whatever to the future. But on searching into the

treasures of divine wisdom we discover that there is an importance and significance about this fact, which we would not gather from the Exodus narrative. In the 68th Psalm we are informed that it is the purpose of God "to bring his people *again* from the depths of the sea." There is distinctly a reference to the passage of the Red Sea, out of which God brought his people *once*, but no history records the circumstance that he ever brought them up *again*, a second time, from the sea's depths, and especially could this not have been since the production of that Psalm. Let us suppose we had no historic books in the Old Testament—no Exodus to detail the facts connected with that remarkable passage over the bed of the sea, we should be completely ignorant of the meaning of the Psalmist's word. "I will bring my people *again* from the depths of the sea" would be mysterious language which we could not comprehend, and we should no doubt be inventing some spiritual interpretation to explain it. But with the historic narrative before us, with its vivid picture of the passing of that mighty host between the congealed waters of the Red Sea, we are compelled to the conclusion, that the prophetic announcement in the Psalm points to another event of a similar nature which is to occur in connection with the same people at some period of their eventful history. By this means we are also led to know that this Red Sea passage has some relation typically with a future deliverance of Israel.

On this point we are not left to doubt. The later prophets predict that another wonder the *exact* counterpart of the passage through the Red Sea, yet remains to be accomplished. To quote all the testimony would be needless, but we will direct

our readers' attention to a prophecy in Isaiah the 10th chapter where we are told that at a future day, when "the remnant of Israel shall turn unto the mighty God"—the Assyrian of the future will "lift up his staff against Israel after the manner of Egypt. But the Lord God shall stir up a scourge for him, and as His rod was upon the sea, so shall He lift it up after the manner of Egypt." This testimony proves most distinctly that an event similar to that which took place at the Exodus of Israel from Egypt, will be repeated. We know from the Mosaic narrative the effect of the lifting up of the rod over the sea. The result of this act was the dividing of the waters for the people of Israel to pass over. The future lifting up of the rod is to have a like conclusion, for as the rod was employed with a definite effect in the one case, so it is to be in the future one. It is to be lifted up *after the manner* of Egypt, and the result will be the same—for Israel will be released from their last oppressor—"his yoke shall perish from off their shoulder."

In the same verse in Isaiah from which we have already quoted, we are told that a slaughter, is to accompany the other judgment upon the Assyrian of the last day. This slaughter is described as being of the same character as one which is related in the historic record. It is stated that it will be "*according to the slaughter of Midian.*" What do we know respecting this slaughter of Midian? It is obvious we can gather no information regarding the special nature of this historic battle, from the scanty allusion in the prophecy. If we were unable to obtain any knowledge concerning it from another source, we would be incapable of apprehending the full meaning of the prophet. We would have been in

such a position if there had not been in the sacred volume the book of Judges. In this book however there is a full description of the slaughter of the army of Midian in the past, and from this account we are able to comprehend the nature of that destruction which is to overtake the Assyrian in the last days. The future event referred to by Isaiah, is declared to be "*according to the slaughter of Midian*, then the circumstances which attended and induced the historic defeat, must of necessity be repeated, or it could not be said that the future is to be like the past. On turning to the seventh chapter of the book of Judges, we have the account of that remarkable engagement and slaughter. It is evident from the record that the conflict took place in the night, and consequently in the dark. The Jews divided their night into three watches, and we are informed that Gideon proceeded to make the attack at the middle watch, which continued from 10 o'clock until 2, and this would include the hour of midnight. It appears from a careful perusal of the circumstances attending this conflict, which we have recorded in the Bible, that under the hand of God, it was the *darkness* which preventing the Midianites from recognizing each other, and each supposing that the person with whom he came in contact was his enemy, caused "every man to set his sword against his fellow," and by this means the whole army was scattered, with little effort on the part of Israel. Such then is the nature of events that are to occur again in the future, according to the testimony to which we have referred in Isaiah: there is to be in connection with the last wars of Israel, an event in which the characteristics of the Midianitish defeat are to exist. On that future occasion it will again be

in consequence of the darkness, that the mutual slaughter will be induced, and thus the enemies of Israel will be again defeated. There is abundant evidence that this is to be exactly the fact. We learn this from the prophecies of the Old Testament. Even Isaiah tells us concerning these last times that "through the wrath of the Lord of hosts is the land darkened and the people shall be as fuel of fire, *no man shall spare his brother*," Isa. ix. 10. In Ezekiel there is similar testimony, where we are told that "every man's sword shall be against his brother." These references are connected with that period denominated "the day of the Lord," which day it is also declared is a day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and of thick darkness—and they shall lay hold every one on the hand of his neighbour, and his hand shall rise up against the hand of his neighbour" Joel. ii. 2. See also Amos v. 18, 19, 20. From these quotations the reference of Isaiah to Midian is confirmed, and we are thus led to know that, in the future, there is to be the antitype of Gideon's conquest, *so that the historic statement in the book of Judges forms the details of a prophecy which yet remains unfulfilled.*

In Isaiah xxviii. 21, we are also taught in as brief a manner as in the former examples, that "The Lord will be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon." In this instance again, if we were without the book of Joshua, we should be completely ignorant as to what was indicated by this remark. And here we have to rest exclusively upon the historic record to discover what the events are, which will take place at the time about which the prophet is speaking. The narrative of the battle of Gibeon is recorded in Joshua x. 10, 11, as follows "And the Lord dis-

committed them before Israel, and slew them with a great slaughter at Gibeon. And it came to pass as they fled from before Israel, that the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah." Such then, as is detailed in this quotation, is one method by which God will effect the defeat in the future, and these circumstances, combined with others which we need not now enter upon, will bring the judgments which God has threatened against his enemies. If the Lord is again to rise up as in the valley of Gibeon—and this is the only instance in which the enemies of Israel have been destroyed in that place—it amounts to the most conclusive evidence that in the future incident which the prophet foretels, great stones shall fall from the heavens as they did at Gibeon. Here then we have another example of the manner in which the future enemies of Israel shall be defeated and destroyed. The repetition of this historic event is, moreover, corroborated by the prophets, without making reference to the history. We are told in various portions of the sacred volume that God will "rain from heaven great hailstones, fire and brimstone." Ez. xxxviii. 22; Ps. ii. 5; Rev. xiv. 21.

Numerous additional incidents might be cited to the same effect.

The days of Noah are given as the description of the condition of things at the second coming of the Lord. The wilderness journey of Israel, and the pleading *like as* he pleaded with the fathers, the miracles which attended their journey, and the entry into the land of promise—the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, &c., form a reason of which we might obtain accurate pictures of the future; and the fact that the prophets direct our attention to them, is doubtless one object for their insertion in the history of Israel.

In the whole of the instances which we have quoted, it will be observed that there are no details whatever given concerning the prediction in the prophecy. These we can only learn by reference to the history, we are then directed by the book itself to look to the historical events in order to form a just estimate of what they will be when repeated in the future. We wish to impress this point particularly upon our readers' attention—that the history explains the prophecy in all the examples to which we have made reference.

But what do we learn further from these remarks? What is the chief object in the prophecies of the future being so intimately associated with the facts of the past? Are not all these proofs of a very decided nature, that the occurrences of the future will be as *actual* and *real* as those that are historic? We must perceive in these lessons the *manner* in which prophecy will be fulfilled. It will be "*like as it was*" in the former days and in the times of old. Are we then to refuse the teaching of God in these things or to believe it? If he declares that the events in the future are to be like those in the past, are we to deny it? There are some persons who will tell us that no doubt the history of the Old Testament was literal enough, but that the facts were merely types to set forth a future condition of events of a mystical, or spiritual character; and thus, that any prophetic allusions they may have will have a mystical fulfilment. But is this correct? By no means. If the fulfilment is to be of a different nature from the historic accounts to which we have referred, then is it evident they are not to be "*like unto*" or "*according to*" those that are past; and we therefore cease forever to aim at understanding a prediction from the words in which it is re-

corded. No : God does not say one thing and mean another. When he declares that the events shall be alike, it becomes our duty to believe his word, and not to invent some plausible theory by which to build up some spiritual or mystical antitype. The antitypes will be as real and substantial as the types; just as Jesus was as real a man as Moses, and will be at his appearance on the earth again. And as the antitypical sacrifices in the future temple at Jerusalem shall be as actual as those under the Mosaic code.

There is however another side to this question. If the events in the future are of a spiritual or mystical nature, what becomes of those that are past—they certainly must be mystical also, for the events are declared to be alike. So that if we fail to admit the future reality, and literality of these prophetic productions, we transform the history into a fiction, and make the past and the future equally uncertain.

H. N.

---

### A PROVERB.

Abraham had two sons,  
Ishmael and Isaac.

Isaac was a peaceable man,  
And would rather suffer wrong  
Than be contentious.

Ishmael, his brother,  
Was of another disposition,  
He was a wild man ;  
His hand was against every man,

And every man's hand against him.  
Now we, brethren,  
As Isaac was,  
Are the children of promise.  
But as then,  
He that was born after the flesh,  
Persecuted him that was born after  
the spirit,  
Even so it is now.

---

### THE UNWRITTEN RUBRIC.

IN the acts of Christian worship and service we conduct ourselves as if we had a scriptural direction. The fashions of different places vary in some things, but in more are they similar. Now, when we have no direction in the Scriptures, and no precedent from the usage of the Bible personages, and yet follow a uniform style, this style must be the result of tradition. How venerable that tradition may be it is difficult to determine, but still it is not apostolic.

Thus in the act of *prayer* we uniformly close our eyes, or cover them

with the hand; and, indeed, it is reckoned most devout, even when only listening to a prayer to which we shall give our Amen, that we keep our eyes down-cast or closed. Whence has this fashion originated? It is not a scriptural one; thus we read,—“Jesus lifted up his eyes to heaven and said;”—and although we admit that the expression of Isaiah is a figure of speech—“Mine eyes fail with looking up,” yet it is a figure which derives its meaning from the practice of looking up while praying. This is manifest from such phrases as—



"Mine eyes are ever toward the Lord," Ps. xxv. 15; cxv. 1. 8. There is presumptive evidence of this being the uniform practice of Israel in the act of prayer. Now, was it because of the strong feeling of reality in the object of their petitions; or in a certain sensuousness in connection with the place to which the prayer should be addressed? Whichever it may be, we have as good reasons. Is our faith not strong enough to give vividness to the object we address, should we not *lift up our eyes to heaven* as the saints of old did? Or how much is our spirituality aided by the introversion we assume upon closing our eyes. Had it been the fashion in ordinary religious society to pray with the eyes open, we would have fallen into that fashion, and never have missed the abstraction which we pretend to obtain by having them shut. True, the practice of those who use a written liturgy is necessarily to pray with the eyes open. In extemporaneous prayer, however, we do not remember to have seen any who did not shut their eyes. Now, whether are we right or wrong in following this traditional usage? The eye of man is an organ which God has invested with great power, it is the focus of many nervous and mental forces: and in our biological influence upon one another, or on the lower animals, or even in the fascination of the lower animals themselves, this is the medium by which the vital influence is conveyed. The eye of man in short is his noble point. In health it is bright, in disease it is dull, in mental activity it is almost sparkling, while in idioy it is lustreless, and in death it hardly shows the ghost of its former appearance. The animated speaker enforces his eloquence by the eye, and kindles enthusiasm by the vividness of his glance. Would not the intensity of

our prayer be enhanced by open instead of shut eyes? Does not God delight in the beauty and goodness of those He has created, and will not He rejoice in His own handiwork? Should not the brilliant eye of joy be turned toward Him; should not the longing eye, expectant of his answer, look upwards; should not the weeping eyes gaze through their tears to Him who dries the mourner's tears, and gives promise of a time when He shall wipe the tears from off all faces? Even so: let the eyes be lifted, and holy hands with them. These are good reasons for the practice of Christ and his apostles; for the holy prophets and men of old, who feared God and called upon His name. For the other, the traditional practice which we follow, they can render reasons who are its apologists.

Again, in our observance of the *Lord's supper*, we have some very uniform fashions, for which we have not seen the reason, and cannot direct to the tradition. The appointment of that institution was that we should "eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." It has been supposed that there is a rebuke of the Corinthians (in chap. xi. of 1. Ep.), "because they had made a common meal of it." This is not the case—the evil was that it had not been a *common meal*, in the sense of all partaking of the same loaf, and drinking out of the same cup: in eating every one ate his own supper (ver. 21.) But we could hardly imagine how that abuse could have crept in had the original practice been such as we now have; we only taste a fragment of a piece of bread, and little more than wet our lips with wine. Is this eating of the bread (or *loaf*, more properly); is this drinking of the cup? Were it not that we have a veneration for our own traditional usage we would laugh at it. But in so saying we do

not mean to go to the other extreme, and fill ourselves with bread and wine. This could hardly have been possible even in primitive times; for when a large assembly sat down to eat of *one* loaf, it could not fill all, and when they drank of *one* cup, they would not be drunken with it. We have, however, amongst ourselves, in our domestic and social usages, a practice which will suffice to direct us to the proper medium; we offer our visitors refreshment, and they, even when they are not hungry, partake of a small portion—a biscuit, or a piece of cake, and if they call at tea time, they need little pressing to take one cup. Why is the case so different when we formally assemble to eat the Lord's supper? For a company of twelve or more persons

there is laid on the table one biscuit; and when the fragments of the feast are removed, two-thirds of it are left; while the cup of wine has received scarcely a perceptible diminution. And, again, why should there be anything left at all, even though the loaf were a little larger, or the cup could contain more? Now, I would like to know the good end which is served by such infinitesimal partaking of these, the materials of our feast in memory of the Lord. Or can any one direct me to the apostolic rubric which has suggested the practice of which we complain?

In the meantime we leave these things with the brethren, as samples of practices for which we neither find command nor precedent.

G. DOWIE.

## THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

I have long thought it is explained in Mark i. 14, 15, to be the good news that the Kingdom of God is at hand, "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God, and saying, the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the gospel."

But now a brother says, "The question here is, is the intimation and command in ver. 15 explanatory of, or in addition to the preaching of ver. 14. If explanatory, the word "and" must be omitted, thus, "preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God saying, the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand," &c. This is a point, therefore, which must be proved from some other source than this standard proof text.

To this I answer, in the first place, that in other scriptures the phrase

"and saying" is used not as introducing something additional, but as explanatory of what precedes it, just as I have supposed it is used in Mark i. 14, 15. Here are some examples. "Tempting him, and saying unto him, is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?" Matt. xix. 3, "Tempting him, and saying, Master which is the great commandment in the law?" Matt. xxii. 35, 36, "Praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest." Luke ii. 13, "Crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God." Luke iv. 41, "I heard a voice speaking unto me in the Hebrew tongue, and saying, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me." In these cases the phrase "and saying" is used as explaining what precedes it, just as I have assumed it is used in Mark i. 14, 15.

In the second place, is there any scripture where this phrase, standing

as it does in the above scriptures, is used, as introducing something additional, and not as explanatory of what precedes it?

In the third place, Griesbach says that the word "and" in ver. 15 of Mark i. ought to be omitted. He also objects to the words "the kingdom" in verse 14. If Griesbach be right, the passage should read thus, Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of God, saying, the time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand, &c. Now Griesbach is a good authority.

So, then, I still look upon Mark i. 14, 15, as a sure and clear proof that the gospel preached by Jesus at first is the good news that the Kingdom of God is at hand. This point is proved by this standard proof-text.

I am afraid that our brother takes up another position on this subject contrary to the scriptures. He holds that "those Jews who rejected the gospel did not believe in the Kingdom." I hold on the contrary that, while the Jews rejected the gospel of the kingdom, they were firm, cordial believers in the kingdom itself. That is, they believed, on the testimony of Moses and the prophets, that the kingdom promised by God would come, while they rejected the testimony of John, Jesus, and the apostles, that it was at hand.

Did the Jews not believe in the kingdom of God? Why the little children believed in the coming of the Son of David to be king of Israel. What is the Kingdom of God? Is it not the promise that the Messiah should be raised to reign on God's holy hill of Zion over Israel and all nations? And does not Paul say "unto which promise our twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night hope to come." The Jews as a nation did not believe the gospel.

"As touching the gospel they are enemies." But as a nation they did believe in the Kingdom of God. As a nation they believed that all nations shall be blessed in Abraham. As a nation they believed that the Christ should be raised up of the seed of David to be God's King on the holy hill of Zion, there to reign over all nations to the end of the earth. These things they believed as a nation, while as a nation they did not believe the gospel.

One may ask, what then do you make of Gal. iii. 8? Does not Paul here define the gospel to be the blessing of all nations in Abraham? Paul says that this good message was preached before to Abraham. That is before he was circumcised, as in the parallel passage of Rom. iv. But the question is not, what is the good message preached so long ago to Abraham? but, what is the gospel or good message which God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son? Is it not this, that the Kingdom of God is at hand?

Where the gospel of the kingdom is preached to people who are ignorant of the kingdom it is of course necessary to tell them what the kingdom is, as Paul at Athens showed them how that God had appointed a day in which he would judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he has ordained. When we hear that the Kingdom of God is at hand, it is natural to ask where then is the King? and what is that righteousness by which we may inherit it? The answer is, Jesus is the Christ, and he died for our sins. It is thus that the first truth of the gospel preached by Jesus that the Kingdom of God is at hand falls in and becomes incorporated with the rest.

## THE PROXIMITY OF THE KINGDOM.

J. C. has, in page 25 of the February number, maintained that, in Paul's defence, Acts xvii, 31, there is no "PROXIMITY," but simply future "CERTAINTY".

I have taken the liberty to request him to take a second glance at the subject; and tell us whether or not the translation of King James is to be depended on in this case.

The Diaglott runs thus, as nearly as I can recollect "Because he has appointed a day in which he *is about* to judge the world" The difference arises from the rendering of the word "mello" which the Diaglott translates "is about" and which the authorized version renders "will." I call his attention to the fact, that the translators of our English Bible did sometimes translate this "mello" in the same way as the Diaglott has it. John iv. 47, "For he *was at the point* of death." Acts xx. 3, "*As he was about* to sail into

Syria. Acts xviii. 14, And *when Paul was now about* to open his mouth." Heb. viii. 5, "Moses was admonished of God *when he was about* to make the tabernacle." Rev. x. 4, "And when the seven thunders uttered their voices, I *was about* to write."

Will J. C. have the kindness to examine the subjects more carefully with these facts before him, and give replies to the following questions,—First, Does the word in Acts xvii. 31, translated "will" always denote "future certainty"? Second, Does it not always denote nearness, or proximity? Third, Will he name a word in all the Bible that denotes closer proximity than this word Mello?

A. F.

\* I mark in italics the words which represent Mello.

## THE LITTLE HORN.

## MIRACLES.

WITH as little diffusiveness as may be consistent with the topic about which we write, we would direct attention to *miracles* as a mark of the little horn, or the man of sin, or the anti-christ.

The Apostle Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 9, says, his coming is, "with all power (duname), and signs (semeiois), and lying wonders (terasi pseudous)." Precisely the same words are used to describe the miracles, done by the Christ. Acts ii. 22 (compare Heb. ii. 4), "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles (dunamesi), and wonders (terasi), and signs (semeiois), which God did by him in the midst of you." And also of the apostles, 2. Cor. xii. 12, "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, ~~in~~ signs (semeiois), and wonders (terasi), and mighty deeds (dunamesi).

Turning to Revelation xiii. 13, we find the apostle John saying, of the dragon-speaking, lamb-like beast, named also in the xvi. 13, and xix. 20, "the false prophet," that "he doeth great wonders (semeia megala)," or great signs, and "deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by those miracles (semeia) which he had power to do in the sight of the beast," or antichrist. The testimony of the Christ concerning this period of time is, Matthew xxiv. 24 (compare Mark xiii. 22), "for there shall arise false christs and false prophets, and shall shew great signs (semeia megala), and wonders (terata)."

It is certain, from the testimony of the scriptures, that miracles, and signs, and wonders, will be characteristic of the reign of anti-christ. But they will be *pseudo*, false, or lying miracles. *Real* as to appearance, but *false* as to origin.

It is not recorded that they attempted to perform, or rather, imitate, any of the succeeding miracles. See also the statement concerning Simon Magus, Acts viii. 9-24, and also of Elymas the sorcerer, Acts xiii. 8-12.

The false prophet has "power to give breath (pneuma) unto the image of the beast, *that THE IMAGE of the beast SHOULD both SPEAK and CAUSE that as many as would not worship (do homage, pros kunēsōsi), should be killed.*" It is *an image* of the beast, or the antichrist, which is caused to breathe and speak, and not the antichrist himself, for the simple reason, that the antichrist will be a living, breathing person *before* the image is made. For the false prophet, working miracles, sayeth, "to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live." Which, it is obvious, is done.

Is it said, impossible. Let us turn to 1 Samuel xxviii., and, after noting principal features, ask, which we consider would be the greater impossibility, the statement in the preceding paragraph, or, that in the chapter we now refer to. Samuel is dead. Saul enquires of the Lord, but the Lord will not answer him, "neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." He then seeks a woman with a familiar spirit, whom he desires to bring up Samuel. And, *Samuel* is brought up. It is not an *apparition*, but *the man himself*. For, 15 ver., "And *Samuel said to Saul*;" 16 ver., and "*Then said Samuel.*" Do vapors, shadows, or essences *speak*? By permission of the Lord this coming of Samuel was allowed, and 19 ver., through Samuel, his death and defeat on the following day are announced. For, see Lev. xx. 27, and Deut. xviii. 9-14; Saul, by consulting with fam-

iliar spirits, had only made himself again an abomination to the Lord. *And, it is impossible and improbable, that God should make laws against that which has not a positive existence.*

It is true, that we, in these last days, have not yet seen miracles done; and, it is equally true, that for many years, in fact, since the age close to the apostles, miracles have ceased. But cessation of miracles is the exception, and not the rule, during this lapse of time. No student of the scriptures will contradict our statement, when we say, that prophets, apostles, and the Lord himself, attested their right to their position, by signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds.

It is still said, the devil is the antagonistic principle in man. The apostle Paul says, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he (Jesus) also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil (ton diabolou, the accuser)." The apostle John, Rev. xii. 9, says, the dragon is the accuser, and, 10 ver., "Now, is come salvation,—for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night." The accuser having *previously* been cast out of the heaven into the earth. If the heaven mean the higher powers on the earth; and the earth the inferior people or power, and the devil, the fleshy impulses only, how can fleshy impulses be cast out of the higher, to the lower people? Do not all men, irrespective of degree, possess already, carnal or fleshy impulses, desires, and thoughts? The abandonment of these makes men more like unto Christ, it will be admitted. Will then these higher dignitaries sud-

denly become holy, and transfer their impurities to the common people? How can this possibly be, for the apostle continues, 12 ver., "Woe to the *inhabiters of the earth, and of the sea!* for the devil ( $\delta$  diabolos) is come down to you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." If already present *no where else* but in the fleshly thinkings of men, how could he come down at all from any other place?

There is no other conclusion to be drawn from the statements of scripture, than that there is an accuser at present in the heaven as well as in the earth, who, through his messengers, constantly accuses and tries the disciples of Christ. He will be cast *out of* the heaven, to have his sphere of operations limited to the earth for a short time. During this short time, forty-two months, he will energize the antichrist, work miracles by means of the false prophet, and cause signs and wonders to be displayed before the dwellers on this earth; antichrist receiving at his hands power "over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations." That power which *the* Christ refused to receive at his hands, during his

first dwelling on the earth. But, despite of the miracles, signs, and wonders, worked by his instrumentality, he, with his co-adjutors will meet with destruction at the hands of him who is called "*Faithful and True.*"

You will say, why do the inhabitants of the earth have to suffer the reason of the wrath and of the evil one. "He received not the love of God, that they might be saved. *this cause* GOD shall send them *delusion*, that they should believe *lie!* that they all might be condemned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

Let us therefore by earnest prayer unto our God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, endeavour to become rooted and built up in Him, the author of eternal life and salvation; and be clothed with the whole armour of God, that we may be able to withstand *in the evil day*, and having overcome all, to stand. Even in the Christ, whose house are we, *if* we hold fast the confidence and rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.

CHRISTIANOS.

## LETTER FROM BIRMINGHAM.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES.

18 Edward St., Birmingham,  
March 14th 1866.

Dear Brethren,—Permit us to reply in a few words to the criticism of M. in the *March Messenger*. If the writer of it will look at the context of the quoted sentence, he will see that a sound reason is given for our statement. "*Partizan names are always to be found identified with partizan teaching.*"

Certainly, the vital question is, do you believe "the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ; and have you obeyed His requirements."

But the real question at issue between the disciple and the sects, is not, what do we require from them? But, what do they require from us? What do they cover under their assumed names? Are they willing to throw off those things which their names cover, that are contrary to the Word of God, and commence with the first principles of the faith?

For an instance of what we would wish to be understood by our statements, let us take the first, because the most recent of the sects named by the brother "M." In order to be

a "christadelphian," what are we *required to believe?*

1. "The things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ."

2 "That *Jesus of Nazareth is the King* raised up to sit on David's throne, &c,—not therefore the king in the ordinary sense in which a king is the head of a human dominion, but the root and cause, and main-spring of the whole matter, *and therefore comprehensively spoken of as "the kingdom of our father David,"* (Mark xi. 10), *which in him came nigh "1800 years ago,* not for development, but for offer by proclamation as an individual inheritance."

3. That "Human nature is the devil."

4. That, "It is obvious that we misunderstand the mission of Christ if we misunderstand the devil; and hence a scriptural understanding of the doctrine of the devil *is essential to unity in the faith, and fellowship.* The doctrine of the devil is in fact one of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ."

5. That days in prophetic utterance are "equivalent" to years.

Whosoever believeth *all these things* is of the "christadelphian" faith. We, knowing that nearly all these are contrary to the Scriptures, do not accept them, consequently we are not "Christadelphians," nor able to fellowship with them.

The teaching of the Scriptures is *the teaching* to be accepted by the disciples. Saith the apostle John, "Try the spirits whether they be of God." Saith Paul, "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." And again he saith, "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual."—Yours in the Faith.

G. HATFIELD.

H BRITAIN.

M. A. HATFIELD.

NOTE BY EDITORS.—It has been suggested that the propriety of the appearance of the name of H. Britain in these pages, and particularly in the above capacity may be questioned by some who have been unfavourably impressed regarding him through certain published statements. We therefore give our authority for his brotherhood.—In the *Messenger* of May 1864.—Is the following statement:—"we have been compelled to put in force the discipline of the church against brother H. Britain, as he is living contrary to the faith and practice of the gospel of the kingdom."—W. J. B. Of which this interpretation is given in June.—"In sending that communication to the *Messenger* of May last, as secretary of the church, I had no intention of charging Henry Britain with immoral conduct, as no such charge was brought against him at the church meeting, but simply to make known the fact that he was no longer with us; having been cut off from our communion for pursuing a course we, as a community, could not approve."—W. J. BAILEY. Unasked, we have since received the following testimony:—"Although brother Britain was excluded from the Christadelphians, it was never very clear that they had just grounds for doing so; and moreover subsequently he wrote to both D. King, and to the Christadelphians, stating that, if he had done anything contrary to their ideas of discipline, or done wrong to any one, he hoped they would pardon and forgive, and in return he forgave every one. This he wrote, not with a view to be re-admitted as a member of either church. The answer returned, by the Christadelphians was, that "he was *freely forgiven.*" On the Sunday after receiving this he broke bread with us, and has done so ever since, and we have found him a worthy, constant, and estimable brother."—G. HATFIELD.

## ALL IS VANITY.

Earth's pleasures adieu!  
No longer my soul shall be fettered by you!  
The burdens so heavy ye laid on my heart,  
I spurn, and I bid them for ever depart!  
I tear myself free, for I see in their quest,  
Vain glory at best.

Say, what shall I call  
The things which the worldling deems fairest  
of all!

But shadows they are, and but shimmering  
glass,  
But perishing vessels, and bubbles that pass,  
Foul figures in tinsel embroidery drest,  
Vain glory at best.

Say, what are my years,  
As each after each, in the past disappears?  
Say, what are my care, and my labour and

My sorrow, my gladness, the dreams of my  
brain,  
Say, what are my toiling and moiling  
distressed ?

Vain glory at best.

O, riches and gold !

Earth's idol compounded of glistening mould ?  
Of worldly delusions both brightest and worst,  
Increasing, decreasing, seductive, accursed—  
How wretched the slave who obeys your  
behest,

Vain glory at best.

O, honour, what are

Thy crowns and thy garlands that glitter so  
fair ?

The demons of envy are close at my back,  
To tarnish thy jewels, thy footsteps to track,  
With downfall to lower the pride of thy crest,

Vain glory at best.

O, favour and grace !

How speedy your rise, and how fleeting your  
race !

A phantom that springs into life for an hour,  
And fades when the breath of the tempest  
has power,  
Once seen in the sunshine, then darkly  
suppressed,

Vain glory at best.

O, friendship and truth !

Forgetting so oft the devotion of youth !  
Ye beautiful traitors, with smiles on your lips,  
Deserting the spirit in sorrow's eclipse,  
Too sadly I name you, from many a test,

Vain glory at best.

O, carnal delight !

So loathsome within, yet so outwardly bright !  
The gleam of thy visage, the charm of thy  
spell

Are changed in the end, to the torments of  
hell !

Though golden thy cup, its contents are con-  
fess'd

Vain glory at best.

*From the Danish of Bishop Kingo, 1670.*

## Intelligence, Notes, &c.

CROSSGATES.—Another addition has been made to the number of the brethren here, in the person of Thomas Cunningham (miner), son of John Cunningham, who having made the good confession, was immersed into Christ on 11th March. Also, two persons who had withdrawn have returned to fellowship. The brethren have now removed to a right place of meeting, having hired a room, and fitted it up for their own use. The church, though now numbering only seven persons, is in perhaps a better condition than ever. We desire for them, above all things, that they, being firmly knit together in love, and abounding in every good work, may grow up into the likeness of Christ, and be ready for his appearing.

EDINBURGH.—On 12th March, George Shaw (railway porter), by his own desire, was immersed into the name of the Lord, in order to the remission of sins, and bearing that name, in which alone is life: forthwith he was numbered with the saints. On Sunday, March 25, the brethren held their thirteenth anniversary, celebrating it as usual by a social meeting in the afternoon; at which were delivered a report of the past year, with addresses and conversations on many excellent topics. The report shews the present number to be 55, having had ten additions during the year, two removals, and one death—that of David Wilson, a young brother who died at Cupar on March 1st of this year—for a long time previous however he had alienated himself from the brethren

and kept aloof from their assembly. The attendance at the ordinary meetings of the church has been good, and the general aspect of the church is to all appearance healthy. The winter series of lectures is now closed, fourteen in all having been delivered.

At the suggestion of some who desire to see it, we append the programme of the social meeting:—PROGRAMME—Sunday, March 25, 1866. J. Lawrie will see to the programme being carried out. Part I.—Anthem, 'God be merciful unto us' Thanksgiving and Prayer, J. Davidson. Service of Sandwiches, Tea, Cake, &c. Anthem, 'Blessed be God.' Collection to defray expenses. Thirteenth annual report by the secretary, G. Dowie. Thirteenth Annual Report by the Treasurer, J. Cameron. The Sunday Morning Class, W. Norrie. Observations upon the Reports. Anthem, 'O praise the Lord.' Address, 'Our mutual relations and responsibilities,' W. Laing. Anthem, 'Be patient, brethren.' Interval of a quarter of an hour. Part II.—Service of cake and fruit. Anthem, 'How beautiful upon the mountains.' General conversation—'The best method of dealing with applicants for baptism or for fellowship. The subject to be introduced by J. Cameron. Anthem, 'Thou wilt perform.' Narrative, 'Bethsaida Common,' G. Dowie. Anthem, 'Pray for the peace of Jerusalem' Sanctus, No. 4, 'Holy, holy, holy.' Prayer and thanksgiving, W. Wilson. The brethren and sisters will assemble at half past two.



**MUMBLES.**—On Sunday, March 18th, Mrs Lloyd, Richard Gee, and William Michael, were immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus, and afterwards received into fellowship with the church here. We earnestly hope that both they and we may so live as to be accounted worthy of an abundant entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ.

**TRANENT.**—Brother George Kerr, from the village of Elphinstone, in this neighbourhood, is about to sail for Nova Scotia, where he hopes to be able to prosecute his business as a miner, to greater advantage than at home. We cordially commend him to the brethren in Halifax or elsewhere.

**TURRIF.**—Our lectures were well attended by a most respectable and attentive audience. We shall begin another course as soon as health will permit. On the 4th of March, James Boyd (tailor), having made the good confession, was baptized; and having thus put on the Lord, was received into the church by the right hand of fellowship. He stayed a week with us, and unexpectedly left for Aberdeen in search of employment. Since then our brother and sister Harvey have also left; the former going to Aberdeen, the latter to her father's, for the recruiting of her health. We hope that our loss will be their gain.

J. R.

THE LETTER from Halifax, N. S., has been duly received, and forwarded to the person who issued the pamphlet in question; with which pamphlet we are not in the least degree identified: having really as little connection with it as brother Lithgow himself

The Treasurer acknowledges receipts for the *Messenger* from Birmingham, Cupar, Leeds, and Scarborough, Halifax, Wishaw.

On and after May 25th, the address of G. DOWIE will be as formerly, 12 Beaumont Place.

## Publications.

### THE DISCIPLES' CHORAL SERVICE OF BIBLE THEMES,

A collection of Christian Songs,—the subjects selected from the Holy Scriptures, and set to suitable music (in both notations), arranged for four voices. This book, got up expressly for the use of the brethren in their social services, and suitable either for the church or the fireside,

*Is now reduced in price.*

One Shilling in a neat printed cover; One and Sixpence cloth boards, post free. May be had of G. Dowie, 88 Nicolson Street, Edinburgh.

*Also may be had of G. DOWIE,*

THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES,

First Series, for 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864; in single volumes, sewed, 1s.; or the four together, in cloth, lettered, 4s. 6d. The two first Nos. of the vol. for 1860 are out of print, but a few copies of the others are still on hand, and may be had at 1d. each. Postage in all cases extra—for single vols., 2d.; for the cloth vols., 6d.

As it is inconvenient to keep up stock so long, it is desired of those wishing to procure any back numbers or volumes of the *Messenger*, 1st series, to apply before April 15th, as at that time *the whole remainder will be disposed of some other way.*

The following may be had from W. NORRIE, 9 Inglis Street, Edinburgh.

THE DESTINY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE REVEALED IN THE SCRIPTURES. Price 6d.

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN PROTESTANTISM AND THE GOSPEL; 36 pp. 8vo, 6d.

WHAT IS THE GOSPEL? 4 pp. 12mo, 1s 6d per hundred.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD. 1 page, 8vo, 1s. per hundred.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS. 16 pp. 8vo, complete in 12 Nos. at 2d. each. Single Nos. (except No. 5) may be had to complete sets.

SAVING FAITH. 20 pp. 8vo. 1d.

THE BIBLE. 8 pp. 12mo, 2s 6d per hundred.

THE MESSENGER IS REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

Articles should be sent in by the 15th of the month, and items of intelligence not later than the 24th; all papers meant for insertion, or notes of intelligence, may be forwarded to GEORGE DOWIE, 88 Nicolson Street; and all business communications to JAMES CAMERON, 12 Calton Hill, Edinburgh, to whom money orders should be made payable.

# THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES.

“ I SPEAK AS TO WISE MEN, JUDGE YE WHAT I SAY.”

No. 5.

MAY 1, 1866.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II.

## CALVARY AND ZION.

Sacred places indeed. Bible places. Places never to be forgotten. Places never to be remembered but with tears of gratitude and songs of joy. Places which remind us always that Jesus is the Christ, and that he, the Christ, died for our sins.

Christ died for our sins in the place called Calvary. Christ will reign over all nations on the mount called Zion. These two places are represented by these two words Christ crucified. Christ anointed: why anointed? To be God's King on his holy hill of Zion. Crucified. Why crucified? To put away our sins by the sacrifice of himself.

To preach Calvary and Zion is to preach the two great truths of the gospel. Preaching Zion is preaching that Jesus is the Christ, that he is the king of the Jews, that he is the lion of the tribe of Judah, that he is the great shepherd of the sheep—of the ancient fold of Israel; of other sheep who being gathered out of many other folds are to be brought into that ancient fold of Israel. And, besides that, ultimately of every fold or flock of sheep that shall be anywhere in all the world, this is Zion, Christ on Zion.

And preaching Calvary is preach-

ing that Jesus died for our sins, that he is the lamb of God who beareth away the sin of the world, that the good shepherd laid down his life for the sheep.

To preach or believe in Calvary and Zion is to preach and believe in the Cross. I mean in the cross of the Bible: in the true cross. On that cross you see Jesus wounded, pierced, nailed to the tree, bleeding, fainting, dying, dead. And then above his head you read, this is Jesus the king of the Jews. And so Calvary itself, you see, points you forward to Zion.

That Jesus died for our sins in Calvary is a great Bible and gospel truth. That Jesus will reign on mount Zion is also a great Bible and gospel truth. Faith in the one is as essential to salvation as faith in the other. This is saving faith to believe with all our hearts and souls that Christ died for our sins in the place called Calvary. And this is saving faith to believe with all the joy of our hearts and souls that he is coming to reign on Zion. In other words, it is saving faith to believe both that Jesus is the Christ, and that the Christ died for our sins, that he is the lamb of God, and the

lion of the tribe of Judah ; that he is the great shepherd who laid down his life for the sheep.

He who knows these things will see Calvary and Zion in many scriptures wherein another would not see them. As for instance in Rev. i. 5, 8, "Unto him who loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood." There I see Calvary. "And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father ; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen." There I see Zion. It is on Zion that the Son of man shall reign over all nations. There he shall receive the kingdom, and the dominion, and the glory, that all people, nations, and languages may serve him. And there, as washed in his blood, we shall reign with him on and over the earth. For "behold he cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him, they also who pierced him ; and all families of the earth shall wail because of him. Amen." So be it, and soon may he come.

Again I see Calvary and Zion in 1. Thess. i. 9, 10. "And how ye turned to God from your idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead ; even Jesus who delivered us from the wrath to come." Here is Calvary. Jesus rose from the dead. Therefore he died. He died in the place called Calvary. And when he died there he delivered us from the wrath to come ; for he died for our sins. Died that our sins might be all forgiven. And there is no wrath to come to him who has remission of sins. And here is Zion. To serve the living and true God, and to wait

for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead. Just you compare this for a moment with the second psalm. What do you see in that psalm. That the Lord's Christ is to be his king on the holy hill of Zion. That to this end he is begotten the Son of God, from the dead. That therefore we should be wise, serve God with fear, and join trembling with our mirth ; and kiss the Son lest we perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled in a little while.

I see both Calvary and Zion in many scriptures where they are not named. But I will only mention one other example. Gal. i. 4. 5. Who gave himself for our sins that he might deliver us from this present evil age, according to the will of God, and our Father ; to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen. Our Lord Jesus Christ gave himself for our sins. There is Calvary. It was on Calvary that he gave himself for our sins. That he might deliver us from this present evil age. Because his kingdom is not of this world. This evil age will come to an end. It will be succeeded by another blessed, and wise, and righteous age. Then in the regeneration the Son of man will come and sit upon his glorious throne, and make all things new, and judge the twelve tribes of Israel. And there you may see mount Zion.

Now cursed is he who keeps back half of the truth.

That Christ died on Calvary is just half the truth. Separated from the other half, that he is coming to reign on Zion, it is another gospel than that preached by our Lord and his apostles.

D. L.

## THE LITTLE HORN.

## DURATION.

The duration of the power of the little horn, as regards the covenant, is said by Daniel, ix. 27, to be for one heptade, or seven years. For one half of this heptade, Dan. ix. 27; or, for a time, times, and the dividing of time, Dan. vii. 25; or, for a time, times, and a half, Dan. xii. 7; or, for forty-two months, Rev. xiii. 5; this little horn is to hold the saints in complete subjugation; killing also whom he will. This forty-two months being also generally admitted to be equal to the twelve hundred and sixty days of Rev. xi. 3, and Rev. xii. 6. It will have doubtless been noted, that we accept the statement of the scriptures literally, days to us meaning days, naturally; years, natural years, and so on. But one of the most common and prevailing teachings concerning these periods, is that they are not to be measured by our usual standard of time, but by another standard, named prophetic time. In prophetic time, a natural day represents a prophetic year; a natural year, 360 prophetic years; and in a similar manner, other sub-divisions of natural years, represent corresponding prophetic sub-divisions.

But why does a natural year represent 360 prophetic years? From whence is 360 derived? In answer, we are informed that time, prophetically, is regulated by lunar time, and not solar. After all, then it appears that a professed natural, yet representative basis, is the foundation for obtaining this prophetic time. The question then, for us to ask, is, is this foundation substantial? After seeking for an answer to this ques-

tion from astronomy, we shall ask attention to prophetic times already fulfilled, and see what foundation there is in scripture, and history, for this prophetic time.

We would have preferred taking the scriptures first, but, as we are not aware that past fulfillments of prophetic times have met with any fulfilment but natural ones, or, that any allegation is made to the contrary, we are constrained to begin with the astronomical question first.

In astronomical works we meet with the terms lunar time, solar time, sidereal time. A lunar day, a solar day, and a sidereal day, so to speak, are all of equal length, namely, twenty-four hours. But lunar and solar time, regulated by sidereal time, both vary when we pass from days to months, and from months to years, assuming twelve months equal to a year. It is into the cause of this difference we have to inquire, for therein, if there be any, must be found the foundation.

First, then, as to lunar time, regulated by the moon, "the faithful witness in heaven." It is well known that the moon revolves round the earth. Let us suppose that we were present when the moon commenced its first revolution, noting, by means of some fixed star or constellation, its starting point, in relation to the sun and the earth. Now, we should imagine that as soon as one revolution was complete, precisely the same position would be occupied by her between the sun and earth, as when she started. But this is not the case. The earth having also journeyed on in its orbit, has carried the moon with it, so causing a change

of position in relation to the sun. Now the time occupied by the moon in revolving round the earth, is 27 days, 7 hours, 43 minutes, 11.5 secs. This being also the time occupied in returning to its position in relation to a fixed star or constellation, or its sidereal time. But the time occupied in returning to its first position between the earth and the sun is 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, 2.87 sec. This period being named a lunar month, lunation, or a synodic period. Twelve of the former are equal to 327 days, 22 hours, 38 minutes, 18 secs.; and twelve of these latter, to 354 days, 8 hours, 48 minutes, 34.44 secs. Thirteen of the former exceeding the lunar year by only 21 hours, 32 minutes, 55.06 secs. Also, the mean of the former, or so to speak, sidereal year, and the lunar year, being equal to 341 days, 3 hours, 43 minutes, 27.22 secs. The prophetic time, then, finds no support for its 360 days here.

We have now to turn to the earth. The time in which the earth completes a revolution round the sun, having relation to a fixed point among the stars, that is to say, its sidereal time, is equal to 365 days, 6 hours, 9 minutes, 9.6 secs. But, the real or tropical year is 365 days, 5 hours, 9 minutes, 49.7 secs. What is the cause of this difference? It is well known that the apparent passage of the sun across the equinox determines the seasons. But the equinox, participating in a slow movement of the earth's axis, meets, as it were, the sun approaching it, before the sidereal circuit is completed. The space of time thus gained by the earth is equal to 20 minutes, 19.9 secs.; which, if deducted from the sidereal year, will give the real, or tropical year, and also the solar year. This then is equal to 360 days.

Again, it is well known, that the earth revolves on its own axis. Let us suppose a spectator at any given place on the earth's surface, noting at mid-day the precise point in the heavens occupied by the sun, opposite to himself. He would at once infer that precisely at mid-day on the following day after one revolution, he would come opposite to the sun at the same point in the heavens. But he would soon find out that this would not be the case. The length of the day reckoned by the sun would be sometimes longer, at other times shorter, than at first, that is, solar days are of unequal lengths. But if the mean or average of all the solar days be taken in the year, a mean solar day will be obtained consisting of twenty-four hours. Now, it is by the number of mean solar days, that the time occupied by the moon's revolution round the earth, and of the earth round the sun, that their revolutions are computed.

The moon, in conjunction with the earth, revolves round the sun in 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes, 49.7 secs. The moon round the earth, fulfils in the same period, 12 lunations, lunar months, or synodic periods and 10 days, 21 hours, 0 minutes, 15.26 secs., of the thirteenth lunation, so that an equal number of lunations do not represent the solar year. Endeavouring to obtain 360 days, the mean or average of twelve lunations of the moon, and the time of the earth's revolution round the sun, has been taken. But even this only equals 359 days, 19 hours, 18 minutes, 42.07 secs. In spite of ingenious attempts, we are compelled, on the strength of astronomical calculations, which acknowledge no such mean or average, to look upon the 360 days as a delusion, a mockery, and a snare.

ture prophecies, and see what kind of time is observed, natural or pseudo-natural.

**DAYS :—**

Gen. vii. 4, the deluge to be forty days and forty nights.

Gen. xl. 13, 19, dreams of butler and baker to be fulfilled in three days.

Jonah iii. 4, Nineveh to be overthrown in forty days.

Matt. xii. 40, Jesus to be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

Luke ix. 22, the Son of man to be raised the third day.

John ii. 19, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up."

Rev. ii. 10, "Ye shall have tribulation ten days."

**MONTHS :—**

Ezek. xxxix. 12, the house of Israel to be seven months burying the slain.

**TIMES :—**

Dan. iv. 16, 23, 34, seven times to pass over Nebuchadnezzar.

**YEARS :—**

Gen. xv. 13, the Israelites to be afflicted four hundred years.

Gen. xli. 29, seven years of plenty, and seven years of famine.

1 Kings xvii. 1 ; Luke iv. 25, no rain or dew for three years and six months.

2 Kings viii. 1, seven years' famine upon the land.

Isaiah xxxviii. 5, fifteen years to be added to Hezekiah's life.

Jer. xxix. 10 ; Dan. ix. 2, seventy years' captivity in Babylon.

Jer. xxviii. 16, Hananiah to die "this year."

Other instances could be given, but we apprehend that these will be sufficient for the scripture student. Were not all the periods named fulfilled, (save one) in literal years? Can the rule of a natural year repre-

senting 360 prophetic years be applied with safety to these prophecies? As they cannot, why, contrary to revelation and nature, apply them to unfulfilled prophetic times? The one exception we allude to, being the seven months' burial. Will those who contended for these 360 day-years stand by their dogma when we apply it to this unfulfilled period? The house of Israel to be 210 years burying the slain! We "speak as to wise men, judge ye what we say."

We have purposely refrained from noticing Numbers xiv. 34. "After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, forty days, (each day for a year,) shall ye bear your iniquities, forty years." And, Ezekiel iv. 5, 6. "For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days; so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days. I have appointed thee each day for a year." (Margin, "a day for a year, a day for a year.")

The days of search, as well as the days in which Ezekiel lay on either side, were natural days. The forty years in both instances and the three hundred and ninety years also were fulfilled in natural years. Yes, it will be said, proving conclusively that a day does mean a year in prophecy. But several things have to be noted before such conclusion can be drawn. In neither passage, does it state, that a day is equal to a year. But, it is *after* the number of the days, "according to the number of the days." The days were *representative* of the years in these instances, but this does not prove that the days are equal to years because they were

representative. And note well, that *the days* in both instances were not *prophetic days*, but natural days; consequently, could not be equal to years at all. *But the years* in both instances were *prophetic years*, so that, if a day were equal to a year, then each of these *prophetic years* would be equal to as many natural years, as there are days in a natural year.

We have shown that there is no such a year known, in astronomical or chronological periods, equal to 360 days. If a day equals a year, prophetically, then a prophetic year must be equal to 365 natural years for three times in succession, and every fourth time, be equal to 366. Why so? Because 365 days are reckoned for every three years, and 366 for the fourth or leap year. In the face of these plain truths, how is it possible to believe that a day in scripture means anything else than a day, a year, and so on?

It will be said, that the Jewish year was measured by lunations. It is true that 12 synodical months usually composed the Jewish year. The months were alternately 29 and 30 days in length. But, in order to keep the Jewish festivals in their proper seasons, it was found absolutely necessary to add a thirteenth month, lunation, or synodical period, to the usual year; generally, every three years, and sometimes, at the end of two years from last added thirteenth month. This added month was Ve-Adar. There is therefore, no proof here that 360 days were regarded equal to a year by the Jews; and it is on two prophecies, which affected the Jews only, and fulfilled concerning them only, that we are asked to believe that a day is equal to a year; if it is so, then these prophetic years must be reckoned in Jewish time. Some prophetic years

must be equal to 354 natural years, others to 383. Again we urge upon the reader, whether this day equalling a year theory, does not completely refute itself?

What is the testimony of history concerning the commencement, &c., of the assumed 1260 years? The following historical testimonies, in answer, are submitted to the attentive consideration of the reader.

The first record of the decree of Phocas, which is said to have conferred the title 'head of all the churches,' on the Bishop of Rome, is in the year A. D. 780, *one hundred and seventy-four years, after the year 606*, in which it is said to have been given. This record was made by Paul the deacon.

Between the period 606-608, the following empires or kingdoms existed:—Lombardy, Spain, three kingdoms in France, six in England, the eastern empire, and the Persian empire.

The first Pope, whose tiara was ornamented with a triple crown (said to prove that the Pope subdued three kingdoms), was Boniface IX., in A. D. 1389, *nearly 800 years after 606*.

Louis I., Emperor of Germany, in A. D. 815, *exacted an apology* from Leo III., Bishop of Rome, *for having exercised civil judicial power in Rome*.

In A. D. 1061, Harold's brother, Tostig, Earl of Northumberland, accompanied Aldred, Archbishop of York, to Rome, and compelled the Pope to confirm his appointment to the see of York, *by threatening to stop the payment of Peter's pence*.

In A. D. 1234 Gregory IX. was driven from Rome by the senate and citizens, who resisted his temporal power, and seized his revenues.

In A. D. 1296, a papal bull was issued forbidding ecclesiastics to pay

taxes imposed by temporal princes. The kings of England and France resisted this bull. The first, by placing out of the protection of the law those who refused; and the second, by stopping the export of money from his dominions.

Such historical evidence as this might easily be accumulated. Need we say more? Is not the testimony of astronomy, history, and chronology utterly at variance with the year-day dogma?

What saith the scripture as to the duration of the little horn's supremacy over the saints. *The saints shall be given into his hand until a time and times, and the dividing of time. Power was given him to make war forty-two months, and it was given him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them.* Yea, Lord, thy word is truth!

CHRISTIANOS.

## JESUS CHRIST AND HIM CRUCIFIED.

1 Cor. ii. 1, 2.

*Concluded from Page 37.*

THESE are the two things Paul determined to know among the Corinthians for their salvation, Jesus as the Christ, and Jesus crucified. And as there are scriptures which prove that we are saved by believing that Jesus is the Christ, such as 1 John v. 1; Gal. iii. 26; John viii. 24; and John xx. 31: so there are scriptures which as clearly prove that we are saved by believing in him as crucified, such as Rom. iii. 25, and 1 Cor. xv. 1-4.

From this last scripture, we learn that one of the first things of the gospel is, how that Christ died for our sins; that we are saved by believing the gospel; and that there is such a thing as believing the gospel in vain. We believe the gospel in vain if we believe without knowledge. To be saved, we must believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that he died for our sins *according to the scriptures.*

Now, to believe that Jesus is the Christ according to the scriptures, is to believe that God has anointed him to be his king upon his holy hill of Zion, there to reign over Israel, and over all nations to the ends of

the earth. This is believing that Jesus is the Christ according to such scriptures, as 1 Sam. ii. 10, and Ps. ii., &c.

And to believe that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, is to believe that he died not merely that our sins might be forgiven, but also, that we being washed from our sins in his blood, might be made kings and priests unto God, and reign with him on the earth over all nations, when he cometh with clouds and every eye shall see him. This is believing that Christ died for our sins according to such scriptures as Rev. 1-7, and v. 9, 10. But, doubtless Paul refers to the ancient holy scriptures, such as, Ps. xl., xxii., Is. liii., &c. Therefore, let us see in the first place how Christ died for our sins according to these scriptures.

According to Ps. xxii., Christ was to die the death of the cross, as it is written, "They pierced my hands and my feet." And the fact that Christ was crucified, is very closely connected with the fact that he died for our sins, even as Paul observes in Gal. iii., that "as many as are of the works of the law are under the



curse ; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." That is, we are all cursed. No one has continued in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But, behold, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us ; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."

It is well to notice both what is, and what is not written. It is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. It is not written, Cursed is every one who is slain by the sword. Why ? Because the scriptures foreseeing that Christ should die for our sins, and that his death should be the death of the cross, preached the gospel before unto the Jews, saying, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.

Christ died for our sins, according to Is. liii. In consequence of his dying for Israel and all nations, he is made king of Israel and of all nations. He was wounded for our transgressions, &c. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, &c. How wise, and holy, and just, is this. That he who died for all, should be the king over all. One might have died for all, and another might have been king over all. But how much better that he who gave his life for the sheep should be the great shepherd of the sheep. It is Christ that died.

But Christ died for our sins according to such a scripture as Rev. v. 9, 10. Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue, and people and nation ; and hast made us to our God kings and priests, and we shall reign over the earth. We

shall reign over all nations with Christ when he comes and appears in his glory. This is believing that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures. And unless we believe he died for our sins according to the scriptures, we believe that Christ died for our sins in vain. Some believe that Christ died for our sins in order that we might reign with him in kingdoms beyond the skies. This is believing that Christ died for our sins in vain ; for it is not believing that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures. To believe that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures is to believe that he died to the end that we might realize all the exceeding great and precious promises which God has given to his people in all ages. That the creature itself may be delivered from the bondage of corruption ; that he who scattered Israel may gather them, and keep them as a shepherd doth his flock ; that the tabernacle of God may be planted among men, and the nations of them that are saved may walk in the light of it ; that all nations may be blessed in Abraham and in his seed ; that every good thing which God hath spoken may come into existence and stand forever. That is believing how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.

We are often twitted with 1 Cor. xv. 1-4, as though it was against salvation by faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God. I have tried to show how we may turn the tables upon those gainsayers, and beat them with their own chosen weapon. It will be well for them if they be put to silence for their own true and everlasting welfare. May God add his effectual blessing.

D. L.

## THE WITCH OF ENDOR.

In an article on Miracles in *The Messenger*, for last month, the writer (page 66) makes such allusion to the incident of the King of Israel consulting the woman who had "a familiar spirit," as to suggest the idea of requesting a place in these pages, for a statement of the results of a careful examination of the narrative, in the 28th chapter of 1st Samuel. There are three opinions which we have seen stated regarding the remarkable incidents connected with Saul's visit to "The Witch of Endor." *First*, that which "Christians" seems to hold, viz., that this woman had the supernatural power from some evil being, by permission of God, of summoning the dead from their graves, and obtaining from them information regarding future events, and that she really brought up the prophet Samuel from his resting place, who delivered the statements ascribed to him in the passage under consideration. *Secondly*, another idea more commonly held is, that the woman was really an impostor: that she had no such power as she pretended, from God or devil; but, that on this occasion God, for some wise end, did really, and to the amazement of the woman herself, raise Samuel from the grave, to deliver his last message to the rejected King of Israel. *Thirdly*, a good many thoughtful men, and these not all the most incredulous, have come to the conclusion that the King of Israel was duped by the skilful artifice of a cunning woman. This last view seems to us the most warrantable of the three; and we shall endeavor to put our readers in possession of our reasons for so concluding.

principally to the *second view*, as they, along with our reasons for the *third view*, if correct, will also serve as sufficient ground for rejecting the *first*; and because the *second view* seems more worthy of attention, as we believe that it is "God, who raiseth the dead"; and if Samuel rose at all, it was Jehovah, not the Adversary, who brought him to life. Will the reader then notice, in the first place, that God had expressly forbidden his people to resort to such persons as this woman; had declared such persons to be "an abomination unto him," and commanded that they should be put to death, for reasons, we shall afterwards notice, see Lev. xx. 27, Deut. ix. 14.

Secondly, Jehovah had instituted in the midst of his people means by which they might learn his purposes, so far as he saw fit to reveal them. These means were the high priest, dreams, visions, and prophets, see Ex. xxviii. 30, Numb. xxviii. 18 21. 1 Sam. xxviii. 6.

Thirdly, God had refused to give any response to the inquiries of Saul through any of these appointed means. "When Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets," v. 6. The hypothesis that, in this instance, God raised Samuel from the dead, to communicate his purposes to Saul, involves the startling conclusion that Jehovah countenanced a practice which he declared to be an abomination unto him; and, while refusing to answer the king's inquiries through his own appointed media, he answered him through, or while resorting to, means which he had strictly prohibited. Even should it be admitted that the woman had nothing to do

We shall state our objections

curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." That is, we are all cursed. No one has continued in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them. But, behold, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."

It is well to notice both what is, and what is not written. It is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree. It is not written, Cursed is every one who is slain by the sword. Why? Because the scriptures foreseeing that Christ should die for our sins, and that his death should be the death of the cross, preached the gospel before unto the Jews, saying, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.

Christ died for our sins, according to Is. liii. In consequence of his dying for Israel and all nations, he is made king of Israel and of all nations. He was wounded for our transgressions, &c. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, &c. How wise, and holy, and just, is this. That he who died for all, should be the king over all. One might have died for all, and another might have been king over all. But how much better that he who gave his life for the sheep should be the great shepherd of the sheep. It is Christ that died.

But Christ died for our sins according to such a scripture as Rev. v. 9, 10. Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue, and people and nation; and hast made us to our God kings and priests, and we shall reign over the earth. We

shall reign over all nations with Christ when he comes and appears in his glory. This is believing that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures. And unless we believe he died for our sins according to the scriptures, we believe that Christ died for our sins in vain. Some believe that Christ died for our sins in order that we might reign with him in kingdoms beyond the skies. This is believing that Christ died for our sins in vain; for it is not believing that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures. To believe that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures is to believe that he died to the end that we might realize all the exceeding great and precious promises which God has given to his people in all ages. That the creature itself may be delivered from the bondage of corruption; that he who scattered Israel may gather them, and keep them as a shepherd doth his flock; that the tabernacle of God may be planted among men, and the nations of them that are saved may walk in the light of it; that all nations may be blessed in Abraham and in his seed; that every good thing which God hath spoken may come into existence and stand forever. That is believing how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.

We are often twitted with 1 Cor. xv. 1-4, as though it was against salvation by faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God. I have tried to show how we may turn the tables upon those gainsayers, and beat them with their own chosen weapon. It will be well for them if they be put to silence for their own true and everlasting welfare. May God add his effectual blessing.

D. L.

## THE WITCH OF ENDOR.

In an article on Miracles in *The Messenger*, for last month, the writer (page 66) makes such allusion to the incident of the King of Israel consulting the woman who had "a familiar spirit," as to suggest the idea of requesting a place in these pages, for a statement of the results of a careful examination of the narrative, in the 28th chapter of 1st Samuel. There are three opinions which we have seen stated regarding the remarkable incidents connected with Saul's visit to "The Witch of Endor." *First*, that which "Christians" seems to hold, viz., that this woman had the supernatural power from some evil being, by permission of God, of summoning the dead from their graves, and obtaining from them information regarding future events, and that she really *brought up* the prophet Samuel from his resting place, who delivered the statements ascribed to him in the passage under consideration. *Secondly*, another idea more commonly held is, that the woman was really an impostor: that she had no such power as she pretended, from God or devil; but, that on this occasion God, for some wise end, did really, and to the amazement of the woman herself, raise Samuel from the grave, to deliver his last message to the rejected King of Israel. *Thirdly*, a good many thoughtful men, and these not all the most incredulous, have come to the conclusion that the King of Israel was duped by the skilful artifice of a cunning woman. This last view seems to us the most warrantable of the three; and we shall endeavor to put our readers in possession of our reasons for so concluding.

We shall state our objections

principally to the *second view*, as they, along with our reasons for the *third view*, if correct, will also serve as sufficient ground for rejecting the *first*; and because the *second view* seems more worthy of attention, as we believe that it is "God, who raiseth the dead"; and if Samuel rose at all, it was Jehovah, not the Adversary, who brought him to life. Will the reader then notice, in the first place, that God had expressly forbidden his people to resort to such persons as this woman; had declared such persons to be "an abomination unto him," and commanded that they should be put to death, for reasons, we shall afterwards notice, see Lev. xx. 27, Deut. ix. 14.

Secondly, Jehovah had instituted in the midst of his people means by which they might learn his purposes, so far as he saw fit to reveal them. These means were the high priest, dreams, visions, and prophets, see Ex. xxviii. 30, Numb. xxviii. 18 21. 1 Sam. xxviii. 6.

Thirdly, God had refused to give any response to the inquiries of Saul, through any of these appointed means. "When Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets," v. 6. The hypothesis that, in this instance, God raised Samuel from the dead, to communicate his purposes to Saul, involves the startling conclusion that Jehovah countenanced a practice which he declared to be an abomination unto him; and, while refusing to answer the king's inquiries through his own appointed media, he answered him through, or while resorting to, means which he had strictly prohibited. Even should it be admitted that the woman had nothing to do

with the communication given, still Saul evidently believed that she had; indeed, if the appearance was real, the woman had to do with it either directly or indirectly; for had the king not applied to her there is no reason to believe that the prophet would have been "disquieted," or that the communication would have been received; so that we are shut up to the conclusion that Jehovah answered the request of the king by or in consequence of his resorting to this woman, while he refused to respond to him by prophets, by dreams, or by Urim. The circumstance would become known in Israel very soon; and there is every likelihood that the woman's trade would be greatly promoted, so that this "abomination to the Lord" would become exalted in Israel, through the action of Jehovah himself directly or indirectly. Is not the conclusion tremendous? yea, blasphemous? Yet it seems inevitable on this hypothesis.

Certainly this much will be granted, that if the appearance of Samuel was real, then God while refusing to answer Saul by a prophet, really did answer him by a prophet; God refused to respond by a *living* prophet, yet he raised one from the dead to deliver a message that might have been given through "the Urim," a "dream," or "a prophet," already living.

'Christianos' writes "Saul by consulting with familiar spirits had only made himself again an abomination to the Lord. And, *it is impossible and improbable that God should make laws against that which has not a positive existence.*" (Mess. p. 60). This language is somewhat ambiguous. God had forbidden his people to consult such women as that to which the King of Israel had recourse in the case before us; and we are not aware of any who receive the scrip-

tures who deny that such persons and practices had "*a positive existence,*" so that in this view of the statement quoted, it is quite unnecessary. We however take 'Christianos' to mean that, if such persons as this woman did not really perform what they pretended to do, *it is impossible and improbable that God would make laws against them.* If they really had not "familiar spirits," then it is "impossible and improbable that God should make laws against them." We would in charity presume that the writer has not sufficiently pondered his declaration; for the same sort of reasoning would make the objects of heathen worship realities, in the same sense. Jehovah forbade his people to bow down before the gods of the nations, or serve them, therefore these objects of worship must have been really gods, since "it is impossible and improbable that God should make laws against that which had no existence." Should our government command that "all spiritual mediums" be banished from the country, would it be fair to infer that these creatures were not impostors; or that the government acknowledged their pretensions? Assuredly not. The God of Israel, in prohibiting these practices in question, used the terms concerning them by which they were commonly denominated; and every one can see the propriety of his doing so, whether these practices were *bona fide* what they professed to be, or only impostures. Either way these practices were dishonouring to God, and injurious to his people. To see this we have only to revert to the terms in which they are spoken of in the law of Moses. "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations, there shall not be

found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or necromancer; for all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord; and because of these abominations the Lord thy God did drive them out before thee. Thou shalt be perfect before the Lord thy God. For these nations which thou shalt possess, hearkened unto observers of times, and diviners; but as for thee, the Lord thy God hath not suffered thee so to do," Deut. xviii. 9-14.

Jehovah had, as formerly mentioned, instituted means amongst his people by which they might learn his will; and as the arts specified were practised by idolators, and professedly associated with idol worship, those who had recourse to them despised the oracle of God, and paid homage to the gods of the nations. The evil effects of such conduct among the chosen people of God are easily perceived, whether 'the divinations' were pretended or real. Among such a people the pretension if believed in and resorted to, was as deleterious as the reality; consequently the prohibition was as proper in the one case as in the other.

In favour of the hypothesis we are objecting to, it is urged that the narrative asserts that Samuel spoke to Saul, vers. 15, 16. This is true; and we admit that the circumstance is very strong evidence in favour of the reality of the appearance; and it is only because we are driven from it by the considerations formerly stated

that we have not held that position. These considerations, however, appear so serious that we feel shut up to understand the language of the narrator as simply descriptive of the events as they appeared to Saul; and there are not wanting, either in the scriptures, or other faithful narratives, instances, in which events are described according as they appeared to the spectators, and not as they actually happened. For the reasons already alleged, as well as for others to be submitted, we have been led so to regard the narrative before us. The reader will judge for himself which is the wisest alternative.

The defence of the third idea, that the transaction on the part of the woman was a pretence, we must reserve for another occasion; meanwhile we would conclude with this observation, That whether Samuel really appeared or not, the transactions, as narrated, give no countenance to the idea of the conscious existence of disembodied spirits. There is no mention whatever of "the spirit" of Samuel. It was *Samuel* who is alleged to be "disquieted" and "brought up" "an old man," decently attired "with a mantle." Neither Saul nor the woman seems to have had the idea of consulting "naked spirits," invisible ghosts, who made themselves manifest by "raps," or strange noises. She did not "call up spirits from the vasty deep," but disturbed the repose of the dead, and brought them out of their graves, ere she could obtain from them the desired information. Truly "THE DEAD KNOW NOT ANYTHING."

W. L.

Now a days we have many hedge-breakers, very few to make up the breach and let down the sluices, that the gushing stream of God's vengeance may be stayed.—*Arthur Dent*, 1607.

## PERSISTENCE OF OLD BIBLE NAMES.

THE transmission, through so many centuries, of the Biblical names of places in the Holy Land, is a standing monument of the truth of the Bible. It is hard to extirpate the aboriginal names of a country. The race which is spreading over British India, at the present day, when they plant a new town now and then give it a new name. The old places on the contrary retain their old names. The Romans who extended their arms over Gaul, Britain, and parts of Germany, originated but few, very few, of the names now borne by the cities and villages in these countries. Even when the earlier inhabitants have disappeared before the new comers, as in the case of the Etruscans in Italy, or the Indians in some parts of America, they have left traces of their language behind them. Our own (American) mountains and rivers, with their Indian appellations, are not more enduring than the proofs that an older race inhabited these shores before our forefathers came to them. If, then, the records of the Old Testament are true, the successive waves of conquest that have swept over Palestine cannot have obliterated all the marks of early times. If the towns, mentioned as existing there in the age of Abraham, Joshua, or David, existed really, it must be possible to identify many of them still. As, on the one hand, the impossibility of finding any trace of them now would discredit the sacred historians, so, on the other, the discovery of the same names applied to existing localities, their preservation, notwithstanding so many invasions of Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, Persians, Saracens, Crusaders, and Turks, who have overrun the country at different times, becomes a striking witness to the truth of the Scriptures. I will not undertake to state numerically how large a proportion of the towns mentioned in the history of Joshua's conquest of Canaan occupy their ancient site; but, considering the antiquity of the record, it is surprisingly great. To these, of so early a date, should be added others, first noticed in the Old Testament or the New, at a later period. They bear the same names as in ancient times, slightly changed, in conformity with Arabic, the spoken language of the East. Even in cases where, during the reigns of the Seleucidae and the Ptolemies, some of the Scripture places received Greek names, they generally lost them, in course of time, and regained their proper oriental appellations. Hamath, (Joshua xix. 35), known in the age of the Greeks as Epiphania; Tadmor, (2 Chronicles viii. 4), as Palmyra; Rabbath Ammon, (Deu-

teronomy iii. 11), as Philadelphia, are examples of this tenacity of the East in asserting the rights of its own language, and rejecting foreign innovations. Indeed, these changes appear never to have been current among the natives of the country, and ceased as soon as the power which had imposed them was broken. In the few instances in which towns in Syria have Greek names at the present time, as Antioch, Tubariyeh, and some others, it will be found, almost universally, that the towns were of Greek origin, or founded by those in the Greek or Roman interest, and, consequently, had no previous name of which they could be dispossessed.

The chief requisites for establishing the identity of a place are that the modern name be the same as the ancient one, or deducible from it, and that the situation agree with what is said or implied on that point in the Scriptures. The geographical notices of the Bible, even in regard to places very ancient and comparatively obscure, are sometimes remarkably specific. Thus, in Judges xxi. 19, it is said that Shiloh, where the ark of the covenant was kept, in the days of the Judges, was "on the north side of Bethel, on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Bethel to Shechem, and on the south of Lebonah." I lodged at Bethel on the night of the twenty-eighth of April; on the next day, at the distance of a few hours north of Bethel, I turned aside to the right to visit Shiloh, or Shiloh, and soon after passed on the left, El Lebbun, the Lebonah of Scripture, as I pursued "the highway" to Nablus, the ancient Shechem. The identification of this last place is made out with entire certainty by a process of historical combination, and in a different way, therefore, from that adopted in most cases, and described above. At Maon, the Maon of Nabal, (1 Samuel xxv. 2), near Hebron, the traveller has in view, at once, at least seven, not improbably nine, different places which retain their ancient names but slightly modified. Among these, besides Maon, are Semua, Attir, Anab, Schuweikeh, Yuttah, which correspond respectively to Kshtemoa, Jattir, Anob, Socoh, and Jutiah, all mentioned in the early book of Joshua.

Besides the foregoing examples, in order to show more fully the nature and the extent of the resemblance between the ancient and modern names, I subjoin the following list, placing those with the modern or Arabic orthography on the left, those with the Hebrew or Greek on the right.

Anata, .. .. .	Anathoth.
Akka, .. .. .	Acco.

Askulan, .. .. .	Askelon.
Beit Sur, .. .. .	Beth Zur.
Beit Lahm, .. .. .	Bethlehem.
Beit Ur, .. .. .	Beth Horon.
Beisan, ... .. .	Beth-Shean.
Bireh, .. .. .	Beer, Beeroth.
Demaskh, .. .. .	Damascus.
Deburieh, .. .. .	Daberath.
Endur, .. .. .	Endor.
Esdud, .. .. .	Ashdod
Gazur, .. .. .	Gesur.
Ghuzzeh, .. .. .	Gaza.
Gib, .. .. .	Gibeon
Hulhul, .. .. .	Halhul.
Hummam, .. .. .	Hammath.
Jebna, .. .. .	Jabneh.
Jeba, .. .. .	Geba.
Jelbon, .. .. .	Gilboa.
Jebah, .. .. .	Gibeah.
Jenin, (probably), .. .. .	En-Ganim.
Jufna, (probably), .. .. .	Ophni.
Kana, (unchanged), .. .. .	Kana.
Khurmul, .. .. .	Carmel.
Libnan, .. .. .	Lebanon.
Ludd, .. .. .	Lydda.
Mejdel, .. .. .	Magdela.
	Migdol.
Mucmas, .. .. .	M'chmash.
Nasirah, .. .. .	Nazareth.
Nein, .. .. .	Nain.
Ram, .. .. .	Rameh.
Rameh, .. .. .	Ramah.
Riha,* .. .. .	Jericho.
Saida, .. .. .	Sidon.
Salim, .. .. .	Salim or Shalim
Sarafend, .. .. .	Sarepta.
Selwan, .. .. .	Siloam.
Sur, .. .. .	Tyro.

Solam, .. .. .	Shunem.
Tekua, .. .. .	Tekoa.
Tubari'eh, (of Greek origin), .. .. .	Tiberias.
Urtas, (probably), .. .. .	Etam.
Yafa, .. .. .	Joppa.
Yalo, .. .. .	Ajalon.
Zerin, .. .. .	Jezebel.†

I mention the foregoing as examples only of the similarity which they illustrate, and mention these in preference to others, that would be equally pertinent, because they happen to be among the places which it was my good fortune to visit or to have a sight of. What is worthy of special note is, that many of these names have been brought to light recently. Some of them have hardly been mentioned in books since they were last mentioned in the Bible, till the present century, or the last. Geographers and tourists have traversed the land, and, as they have asked the inhabitants to tell them the names of their villages, have had the old Scripture names given back to them from the mouths of the people.—*Hackett.*

† I cannot refrain from bearing testimony here to the very great value of the "List of Arabic Names of Places" appended to the third volume of the "Biblical Researches." They were collected and arranged by the Rev. Dr. Smith, of Beirut, as the fruit of inquiries made in the course of various journeys in all parts of Palestine, during a period of several years. The traveller, who would obtain a knowledge of the ancient and modern topography of that country, whatever other helps he may forego should not omit to carry with him a copy of those "lists" so remarkably full and accurate.

\*Though these words appear so unlike to the eye, the ear finds them quite the same: as Riha has a strong guttural pronunciation. This remark applies to some of the other names.

### THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

In last number L. has adduced instances of the phrase, "and saying" being used to introduce a sentence explanatory of a preceding one. He also asks if there is "any scripture where this phrase, standing as it does in the above scriptures, (those quoted) is used as introducing something additional." Supposing there happened to be none, what then? Why, simply that the usage pled for by L. may be the rule for Mark i. 14, 15. But what is needed for a proof text is not that it *may* be read in a given way, but that it *must* be read in that way and in no other. As the language *may* naturally be read as an addition to what precedes, any argument based upon it one way or the other is reduced to a peradvanture.

As to Griesbach as an authority I have no objection, so long as it is clearly understood that a proof text which is employed to sustain any position is not indebted to the critical scizors for mutilation before it can speak with the necessary authority, and above all so long as

it is admitted that the most learned critic in the world is at his best estate altogether fallible.

I suggested that "those Jews who rejected the gospel did not believe in the kingdom." In replying to this, L affirms that "as a nation, they (the Jews) did not believe the gospel." There is a fallacy lurking here in the use of the phrase "AS A NATION." L. evidently uses it to denote the mass of the Jews, the common people. But what is the testimony. "I then went out to him (John the Baptist) Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." We surely have here the masses, and that as distinguished from the Pharisees and Sadducees whom John met with well merited rebuke. Again—"All the people that heard him and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized



of him." It is thus testified that masses of the Jews confessed their sins in being baptized. They must have obeyed the command—"Repent." And it is doing them nothing more than bare justice to conclude that they repented for the right reason—"for the kingdom of God is at hand." But what of the Pharisees and lawyers? Did they either confess, repent, or believe in the kingdom? Their kingdom was the kingdom of God in its then overturned condition, subjected to a foreign yoke, under which they were permitted to enjoy a little brief authority, which, with its paltry emoluments they doubtless viewed as a bird in hand worth any number in the bush. Hence "OUR PLACE" formed their primary consideration in the event of the Romans coming to enforce their endangered supremacy, John xi. 48.

But if the Jews "AS A NATION" rejected the gospel, and yet the gospel was believed by the common people, how is the phrase "as a nation," to be understood." Simply as an organized body acting in a national capacity through its proper functionaries. In this sense the Jews as a nation rejected the glad tidings concerning the kingdom of God, no matter how many of the people believed. And not only so, but there is no reason to believe that the rulers had any genuine faith in the future existence of the kingdom of God under the Messiah, either at hand or distant. And it was the rulers who alone could perform a truly national act or give expression to the national faith. The nation of Israel was not a republic, in which public opinion could be expressed, through a chief magistrate the elect of the people, and the popular will thus find embodiment in a national act. It was an absolute monarchy, whose laws even were beyond the touch of king or parliament, except to be justly administered.

But while it is evident that the mass of the people believed the gospel as publicly preached by John, Jesus, and the other apostles, which was identically the same announcement, comparatively few became the disciples of Jesus, and continued faithful. The reason of this is obviously because faith in something not publicly preached was requisite to constitute a true disciple. It was necessary to believe that Jesus is the Christ, or in other words to believe in his name. "He came unto his own and his own received him not; but as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to THEM THAT BELIEVE IN HIS NAME," John i. 11, 12. "When he was in Jerusalem at the passover, in the feast day many BELIEVED IN HIS NAME, when they saw the miracles which he did," John ii. 23. We have an example

of this class, who "received" Jesus by believing in his name," in Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, who told the latter, referring to Jesus—"We have found the Messiah." And immediately afterwards we have an emphatic recognition of him by Nathanael in these terms—"Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel," John i. 42, 50. The words of Jesus to Nicodemus shew the necessity that existed even at that early period of our Lord's ministry, for believing in his name. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believed in him, should not perish but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not BELIEVED IN THE NAME of the only begotten Son of God." John iii. 16, 18. It is thus evident that to become a disciple of Christ during his personal ministry, and an heir of everlasting life, it was as necessary to believe in his name, although never publicly preached, as it was to believe concerning the kingdom of God. And it was as necessary to believe this unpreached element of the gospel at that time, as it was afterwards when Peter proclaimed it to assembled thousands on the day of Pentecost, or when Philip evangelized it in the city of Samaria.

This appears to me to be what constituted the difference between the mass of the Jewish people, as a nation, and the disciples of Jesus. "He came to his own, and his own received him not"—that is, in the character which pertained to him as the Messiah. The chief priests and rulers declared they had no king but Cæsar—thus manifesting their disloyalty to their own kingdom, and casting in their lot with Gentile usurpation. In conformity with this spirit, they had long before "agreed that if any man did confess that he (Jesus) was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue." After the raising of Lazarus, however, many "BELIEVED ON HIM," (Jesus), and the rulers resolved upon his destruction. Even this could only be carried into execution by bribing Judas, and arranging to effect Jesus' apprehension "in the absence of the multitude."

In reply to A. F.'s questions I would say first,—When the word *mello* is used by God through any of his inspired servants, it always denotes future certainty. Second,—*Mello* does not always denote nearness or proximity. Third,—I am not sufficiently learned in the precise meanings of all the original words in the Old and New Testaments as to name those that may

denote closer proximity than this word *Mello*.

In support of my answer to No. 2, which is the most essential, I would refer to one instance where *mello* does not denote nearness or proximity. I refer to Matt. xvi. 27. "For 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 words "SHALL COME," here represent *mello* in the Greek. The event referred to, is not the nearest or most proximate in relation to the Lord. He had just intimated his approaching death and resurrection. These were events nearer at hand than his coming in the glory of his Father, with his angels to reward every man according to his works, and yet he does not use *mello* in intimating them. Besides, his

coming in glory necessitated his going away; for he could not come so long as he continued to be present. Here then was a third important event to intervene.

The simple fact is that *mello*, like many other words, seems to have more than one meaning. According to the Polymicrian Greek lexicon, "It corresponds to the auxiliaries *will, shall, must*, and may sometimes be expressed by *to intend*," &c. Hence the translators of the common version had a choice of renderings and in the exercise of their own judgment in the case inserted the word "*will*."

The question as to whether the common version or the Diaglott is absolute correct is thus left open, and no one should seek to sustain a position by adducing a questionable authority. J. C.

### THE POWER OF GOD IN HIS WORD.

No human intellect,—we boldly venture the assertion,—no human intellect, and no amount of human learning yet gathered, are competent to the task of accounting, on any known natural principles, for the strange existence in our world of a series of writings, and corresponding influences, so unearthly in their power, yet so human in their form—so deep in the world's thought, yet so constantly in conflict with all contemporary thinking, and therefore, at each period of its existence so utterly opposed to any idea of development,—teaching the absolute unity of God through all the black night of the Western polytheism, the vivid personality of God in the denser darkness of the Eastern pantheism, the holiness of God amid everywhere surrounding forms of worship so impure that they cannot be described, the unrepresentable essence of God when the world was full of a monstrous idolatry or a foul Egyptian symbolism,—proclaiming salvation by the Cross when the schools were

priding themselves on the perfection of their ethical philosophy, announcing the resurrection of the body when the select thinkers were soaring in their Platonic spiritualism, and a new and heavenly life for the soul when the vulgar herd of Epicurus were filling the air with the swinish noise of their sensualism,—triumphing alike over the Senecas and the Neros, the Antonines and the Domitians, overthrowing the giant power of ancient Paganism, driving it from that last stronghold of conservatism it had sought in the philosophic revival of the early myths, shedding a holy light during the long period of Barbarian and Mediæval darkness, breaking forth with new splendour at the Reformation, and yet filling men's minds with fear, or sustaining them in heavenly hope, in the face of a war that never raged so fiercely as in these days when naturalism and criticism combined, as they were never combined before, are doing their utmost to shake the authority of its divine mission.—*Dr Lewis*.

### Intelligence, Notes, &c.

CROSSGATES—Since last notice there has been another addition in the person of a second son of brother Cunningham, who made

confession of his faith, was immersed into Christ, and joined the fellowship of the Church. EDINBURGH.—On April 5th, James Dowie,

(son of brother G. Dowie) made confession of his faith in the gospel of God's dear Son, and was forthwith immersed into Jesus Christ. On the following Sunday he was received into the fellowship of the Church. This is the youngest disciple we have had introduced to us—as he is not quite 15 years of age; but withal of a clear judgment and staid manner. This addition makes up the whole list of names on the roll to 66, including two in Australia, two in South America, and one at present in Cumberland; last month's statement was therefore incorrect.

GLASGOW.—“Sister Mrs Allen (late Miss Mason) came here from London a month ago, and was admitted to the Church, having previously given a satisfactory statement of her faith, and presented a communication from the brethren in London, recommending her to our fellowship.

The brethren propose remaining another year (should the coming of their Lord not intervene) at their present address, 38 Bath Street, where they will be glad to see any of like faith, who may be sojourning in the locality. Owing to certain matters that have happened in the Institution, the brethren will be obliged to close the doors for a limited time during the hours of worship, but this will form no barrier to any one, attending at the proper hours—which are 11 A.M. and 2 P.M.”—

THE INQUIRER.—“Will any of your scholarly friends please inform me, through your pages, what is the real value of that expression in 1 Cor. xv. 52 “at the last trump.” Does the phrase imply that there is no trumpet to be sounded after it, or is it only a trumpet sounded at the end?”

Also, please say how “Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father,” as stated in Romans vi. 4.—Q.

The Treasurer acknowledges receipts for the *Messenger* from Glasgow, Mumbles, London, and Nottingham.

On and after May 25th, the address of G. DOWIE will be as formerly, 12 Beaumont Place.

## Publications.

### THE DISCIPLES' CHORAL SERVICE OF BIBLE THEMES,

A collection of Christian Songs,—the subjects selected from the Holy Scriptures, and set to suitable music (in both notations), arranged for four voices. This book, got up expressly for the use of the brethren in their social services, and suitable either for the church or the fireside,

*Is now reduced in price.*

One Shilling in a neat printed cover; One and Sixpence cloth boards, post free. May be had of G. Dowie, 88 Nicolson Street, Edinburgh.

*Also may be had of G. DOWIE,*

### THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES, 1st SERIES.

A few copies are retained in hand for a short time longer, and can be supplied to the brethren at the price before announced, viz:—The four volumes, 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864, stitched and in paper covers, 1s. each; or the four in one volume, cloth lettered, 4s. 6d. Postage of single vols. 2d. of cloth vols 6d. vol. 1, (1860) is imperfect; but single numbers of 4-12, may be had at one penny each.

The following may be had from W. NORRIS, 9 Ingliston Street, Edinburgh.

THE DESTINY OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE REVEALED IN THE SCRIPTURES. Price 6d.

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN PROTESTANTISM AND THE GOSPEL; 36 pp. 8vo, 6d.

WHAT IS THE GOSPEL? 4 pp. 12mo, 1s. 6d. per hundred.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD. 1 page, 8vo, 1s. per hundred.

THE GOSPEL WITNESS. 16 pp. 8vo, complete in 12 Nos. at 2d. each. Single Nos. (except No. 5) may be had to complete sets.

SAVING FAITH. 20 pp. 8vo. 1d.

THE BIBLE. 8 pp. 12mo, 2s 6d per hundred.

### THE MESSENGER IS REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

Articles should be sent in by the 15th of the month, and items of intelligence not later than the 24th; all papers meant for insertion, or notes of intelligence, may be forwarded to GEORGE DOWIE, 88 Nicolson Street, till 25th May, afterwards 12 Beaumont Place; and all business communications to JAMES CAMERON, 12 Calton Hill, Edinburgh, to whom money orders should be made payable.

# THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES.

"I SPEAK AS TO WISE MEN, JUDGE YE WHAT I SAY."

No. 6.

JUNE 1, 1866.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II.

## LET BROTHERLY LOVE CONTINUE.

LET brotherly love continue! Why should it not? Our affection is no mere maudlin sentiment provoked by the intoxicating excitement of a conviction which, though strong enough at first, has no power to keep it in life and vigour. Nay: we know and are sure that God has loved us; aye, and still loves us; therefore, if it were once right to love one another because God has loved us, it is always right. Let us not forget our first love, its warmth, its intensity, its purity, and forbearance. *Let brotherly love continue!*

Let brotherly love continue, though we do not see everything alike. It is when the Lord brings again Zion that Israel shall see eye to eye; it is when that which is perfect is come that we shall see face to face, and shall know even as we are known. Meanwhile when we, through the weakness as well as the diversity of our minds do differ in our prospect of things which we see through the glass—obscurely, we are not free to set at nought or despise our brother, and he has no right to despise us. We are but learners, scholars, disciples, all imperfect; and some of us stand on this side the tutor, and some on that; shall we quarrel for difference of

opinion; shall we fight for the power of ignorance—mere word-force; shall we curse that weak brother in our heart because he cannot walk as fast or as far as we can? Shall we envy that strong man who scorns our petty jabberings? No: they both have greater hearts than we; they are ready to accord with us, and the counsel they heartily give is, *Let brotherly love continue!*

Let brotherly love continue! Some whom we have loved have proved unfaithful and unkind. Why should this dispirit us? Where had we been had God dealt with us according to our deservings. Like as a father shews compassion on his children, even so the Lord has had pity on us: and if those children are sometimes pettish, sometimes angry, sometimes ungrateful, so have we been; but the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting toward those that fear Him, and trust in his mercy. If any brother walk disorderly, and not according to the apostolic word, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed; yet *count him not as an enemy*, but admonish him as a brother. *Let brotherly love continue!*

Let brotherly love continue! If

the fire is allowed to go out we shall all be chilled. Should we cause ourselves to suffer because another who has come in will not do as much as we? To spite him shall we punish ourselves? This suicidal conduct blesses nobody: that unthankful churl of a brother is made more churlish, and we shiver with the cold we have ourselves induced. We have rather need to do more—to heap on more fuel, to keep up the fire of love in our own hearts, that it may prevent us being affected by this freezing guest, and also that we should thaw him. There is no reason why the coldness or the indifference of others should overpower us—be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good: *Let brotherly love continue?*

Let brotherly love continue! If it was the first of virtues, it is also the last; for he who adds to his faith courage, knowledge, temperance, patience, and godliness, must needs fill up the perfect measure with brotherly kindness, and love. When we, having put away all malice, and envy, and hate, and the filthy attire of unrighteousness, re-clothe ourselves with peace, and joy, and long suffering, the uppermost garment is love, even the love of the brethren—for if any man love not his brother whom

he hath seen how can he love God whom he hath not seen. *How can he?* The sweet fragrance of this affection is pleasant to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to live together in unity! It is like the precious ointment poured on the head of Aaron, which flowed over his beard, and to the skirts of his garment; like the dew of Hermon, or that distilling on the hill of Zion, where God commands the blessing—even life for evermore; therefore *Let brotherly love continue!*

Let brotherly love continue! God has called us to it. When we owe all to Him, it is a pleasant way to pay our debts in loving one another. Our Lord taught that it is a little matter to love them who love us; we should be able to love our enemies. Yet all that is herein demanded of us is to love those who are our dearest friends. Paul has told us to owe no man anything but love one to another. If this be in us, and live, and abound, we shall be blessed; for he who does the will of God is blessed in the deed, and his commandment is not grievous. For this reason also we ought to love one another. Therefore *let brotherly love continue!*

G. DOWIE.

## THE WITCH OF ENDOR.

(SECOND PAPER.)

WE proceed now to state the arguments ~~for~~ the *third* theory regarding the transactions between the woman at Endor and the king of Israel—viz., That the woman was a cunning impostor, who, by her arts, imposed on the excited and fearful mind of the king. If the reader has made himself familiar with the scripture

narrative in 2 Samuel xxviii, 4-25; and also with our remarks in the former article, we would solicit his attention to the following observations:—*First*, Let the distracted condition of the king's mind be remembered. "The Philistines gathered themselves together, and pitched in Shunem; and Saul gathered all Israel

together and pitched in Gilboa; and when Saul saw the host of the Philistines he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled." vs. 4, 5. Time was, when he would have courageously met the foe, but now his heart was feeble, and trembled greatly. This tremor no doubt arose from, or at least was greatly enhanced by the knowledge that he was under the ban of the Almighty—that Jehovah had rejected him from being king—and that his successor had been chosen. The consciousness of his hapless condition was greatly intensified by the fact, that Jehovah had ceased to acknowledge his requests, or give him counsel. "When Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." v. 6. Thus brought to his wit's end, he, instead of meekly submitting to the determinate counsel of God, in his desperation made himself still more obnoxious to the Divine curse, by resorting to practices which Jehovah had declared to be abominations to him. How terribly daring and foolish it is to run against the bosses of Jehovah's buckler! In this frenzied state of mind Saul presented himself before the woman "who had a familiar spirit;" and demanded of her that she should divine unto him by the familiar spirit; and bring him up whom he should name, v. 8. The Hebrew term rendered "familiar spirit," is "*ob*" a word which is not easily rendered intelligible without explanation. It is used for *a leatheren bottle or water skin*, in some instances, but is most frequently applied to such persons as the woman in the case before us, who professed to call up the dead, and obtain from them information regarding future or doubtful events. It is a circumstance worth knowing, that the Septuagint translation gives as the equivalent of

this term, a word signifying *Ventriloquist*, in the plural *Ventriloquists*, and the probability is that it was by means of this art that this woman and such like, played on the credulity of those who consulted them: passing off the modulations of their own voice, as the voices of the dead. The English reader should, at least, understand that the Hebrew word for "spirit" does not occur where our translation gives "familiar spirit" or "familiar spirits," but the term *ob*, in the plural *oboth*, which the LXX. render by a term equal to our word *Ventriloquist* or *Ventriloquists*, as the case may be.

Observe now, the behaviour of the woman towards Saul. She pretends not to know him till she had seen the alleged apparition. Yet there are good reasons for believing that she knew him from the first. Saul had indeed disguised himself, but there was that about him which he could not conceal. "*From his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people*" chap. ix, 2.

From the acute, observant character necessary in a woman of her stamp, she was not likely to be imposed on by any disguise which Saul might assume; and his extreme height would render suspicion certain. It was however of the utmost moment that she should conceal her knowledge of his person till her own safety was secure. She saw Saul before her disguised—he who commanded her fraternity to be banished from the land; and there was room for her suspicion that he was laying "a snare for her life." The assurance which Saul gave her of her security, set her mind at rest on that point; and was also of such a nature as to confirm her belief that no other than the king of Israel stood before her, "Saul sware to her by the Lord saying, there shall no punishment happen to thee

for this thing. v. 10. Thus assured of her own safety, she inquires "Whom shall I bring up unto thee?" The answer was, "Bring me up Samuel." At this point there is a break in the narrative; we have no account of the process of "bringing up." The next sentence introduces us to the result of that process. The woman no doubt had retired within her recess and performed her incantations before she uttered the loud cry mentioned in verse 12. This scream was, it seems to us, a part of her performance. The king was standing alone waiting the result of his desperate conduct, trembling with emotion; to increase his agitation, and prepare his mind better for her deceptions—she cries out with loud voice, as if stricken with terror also. The phrase "When the woman saw that it was Samuel she cried, &c.," does not imply that the sight of Samuel was the cause of her terror, as some believe; for the alleged cause of her terror was stated by the woman herself to be the knowledge that her inquirer was Saul. Such was the impression made on the king's mind, also, regarding the source of her terror. "The woman said to Saul why hast thou deceived me? for thou art Saul. And the king said to her, Be not afraid." (vs. 12, 13.) The words "When the woman saw that it was Samuel," are, as formerly suggested, used by the narrator as descriptive of the mode in which the deceptions were practised. The woman pretended to have succeeded in her incantations; and pretended that by these means she had learned that her visitor was the king of Israel.

Let it now be observed that Saul did not see the apparition. We are told, indeed, that Saul "perceived that it was Samuel"; but the narrative informs us that the king's perception was derived from the woman's

description of what she pretended to have seen; not from ocular vision by the king himself. Hence Saul enquires "What sawest thou?" To this first question she vaguely answers, "I saw gods (*elohim*) ascending out of the earth." Then the king inquires, "What form is he of? And she said "An old man cometh up; and he is covered with a mantle." The woman purposely avoids identifying the pretended apparition; her wish being to allow the king to do that himself; and knowing that he was expecting her to raise *Samuel*, it was enough for her to describe him according to his usual appearance, of which she was doubtless aware, either by personal observation or description from others. The "mantle" was the upper garment, or *robe*, longer and fuller than the common one, but without sleeves, worn chiefly by men of rank or office, as kings, princes, priests, and prophets; such a robe as Samuel commonly wore; so that the description which the woman gave of the apparition, which she affirmed she had seen, at once convinced Saul that the prophet had risen. There is no mention in the narrative of Saul seeing anything. "Saul said unto her, "What form is he of? And she said, An old man cometh up; and he is covered with a mantle, and Saul perceived that it was Samuel."

That the king's perception was produced by the woman's description, and not by his own vision, is not only apparent from the scope of the narrative, but is also borne out by the use of the Hebrew verb rendered "perceived." It is not the verb (*raah*) to see, as in verse 13, but (*yada*) to know, to perceive with the mind, which is used in verse 14. The conviction, however, which was produced in the king's mind was evidently as strong as if it had resulted

from actual vision; and, therefore, "he stooped with his face to the ground and bowed himself."

Having the king thus completely under her spell, it was easy for the woman, either by her own ventriloquial powers, or those of an accomplice to imitate the voice of the prophet. As yet, however, she was ignorant of the matter on which Saul wished to consult Samuel; and it was necessary she should learn this before proceeding further; but as she was not to give the king what information he wanted, it would of course have been imprudent in her to have questioned him as to the matter on which he desired to be informed. She therefore, very cunningly, makes Samuel demand, "Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?"

The king's reply gave her all the information she required. "Saul answered, I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me; and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams, therefore have I called thee that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do." Having learned the hapless condition of the king from his own lips, it was an easy matter for the woman to put into the mouth of the prophet the prediction of the downfall of Saul, and the selection of David in his stead (see chaps. xiii. 13, 14; xv. 28.) Those predictions, and the fact that David was the man chosen by God to receive the kingdom, were matters no doubt familiar to many in Israel; and were not likely to escape the notice of the observant and intelligent class to which this woman belonged. We need not, therefore, be astonished that she was able to quote so accurately what had formerly been spoken by the prophet to the same person. "The Lord is departed from thee

and become thine enemy. And the Lord hath done to him (rather, see margin) "done for himself) as he spoke by me; the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbour, even to David; because thou obeyedst not the voice of the Lord, nor executed his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day."

The concluding portion of the oracle may be thought to militate strongly, if not, inevitably, against our hypothesis; and, there can be no doubt that this part of the narrative would favour the idea that Samuel really was the speaker; yet we think that it is capable of being harmonized with the view we are supporting. Let us see—It runs thus: "Moreover the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hands of the Philistines; and to-morrow shall thou and thy sons be with me, the Lord shall also deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines." This prediction was speedily fulfilled. How could the woman know that these events were to happen? *Ventriloquism* would not enable her to penetrate the future. Most assuredly not; and yet it is no uncommon thing for mere fortune-tellers to have their predictions verified; sometimes they are very accurate in their statements, and it is doubtless owing to that circumstance that their success in trade, in a great measure, depends. The accuracy of the prediction in this case is very remarkable, on the supposition that it was the simple product of the woman's mind; and yet no one can deny that it might not be, after all, neither more nor less than a happy hit; and that the prediction was simply hazarded. There are not wanting, however, evidence in the narrative that the woman had within her knowledge



certain data which, in a great measure, would assist her in foretelling the speedy downfall of her royal visitor. She knew that his ruin had been predicted by his own God—Jehovah, she had heard from his own lips that his God had ceased to answer him—she was also aware of the strong force which the Philistines had brought against him; and from his great consternation she would perceive his consciousness of weakness to face his long inveterate enemy. Is it too much to believe that a woman of such perception, and careful observation as, from the nature of her occupation she necessarily required to be, was aware of the fact, from the past history of Israel, that when Jehovah manifested his disapprobation towards them, or their leaders, on the eve of a battle, their defeat was certain? Surely not. Supposing, then, that she was, or had not even a *clair-voyante en rapport*, with the fated monarch, which really may have been the case—there was sufficient ground for her concluding that the fulfilment of his predicted overthrow was about to descend on the terror-stricken king—and that the impending battle would decide his fate. It is due to the reader unacquainted with the Hebrew to mention that the term translated “*to-morrow*,” in verse 19, has a wide latitude of meaning; and is sometimes used in the sense of “*hereafter*.” It occurs in this sense in Gen. xxx. 33; Ex. xiii. 14; Jos. ix. 6. 21., so that the defeat of Israel, and death of Saul, by the Philistines’ arms on any future occasion would have fulfilled the woman’s prediction.

Such is the light in which the transactions between the woman at Endor and the king of Israel appear to us. Saul, madly and foolishly suffering under the curse of Jehovah, added yet more to his sin by having

recourse to practices which were abominable to the Almighty, and, in doing so, became the victim of a cunning and deceitful woman. How far our conclusions are borne out by the circumstances of the case, the intelligent reader will, of course, determine for himself.

In addition to the animadversions we made in the first article, on the supposition that the prophet really was brought out of his grave and spoke to Saul, we would submit that, from that view of the matter it appears very strange that the prophet should utter no rebuke to Saul for resorting to practices so displeasing to God.

The only rebuke rendered is, “Wherefore then dost thou ask of me seeing the Lord hath departed from thee, and is become thine enemy?” Not a word about the sin of seeking to those that “peep and mutter,” and have *oboth*. Samuel, before his death, would not have dealt thus with the King; and it is difficult to understand his silence regarding this abomination, if it be the case that he really rose from the dead. We would rather have expected, to quote the words of Henty Fitz, “Burning words, tribulation, indignation, and wrath, for so high-handed, and heaven-daring an offence, as Saul’s last act must be branded, to have burst from the lips of the prophet, instead of the recital of an old prediction, and an inquiry to learn the cause of his being *disquieted*.” We might also have reasonably expected such a rebuke to be followed by an absolute refusal to give any information.

It is also a strange looking circumstance that the prophet, if he really had been raised, while knowing what was shortly to befall the fated king, should be ignorant of Saul’s reason for bringing him up. On the hypothesis we have defended, this alleged ignorance has been accounted for;

but, it will be difficult to explain it or the supposition of the reality of Samuel's appearance.

As formerly observed, which ever way we view the narrative, it affords no support to the common belief that good men, at death, go to heaven.

Samuel speaks of being *disquieted* like one who had been asleep. Of being "brought up," not *down*; and in the scriptures heaven is always spoken of as being above, not below. Manifestly the language gives the representation of *Samuel* rising, or being caused to rise, out of the earth, and that he was to return thither to be joined on the morrow by Saul and his

sons. If Samuel returned to heaven, the king of Israel and his sons went there also, "To-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me," v. 19, "A happy change" indeed! We are careful to state the matter thus for two reasons, First—to shew those who take the narrative under consideration as a proof of the conscious existence of men between death and resurrection, that it affords them no support—And secondly, to shew that a person may believe that Samuel was really raised from the dead, and yet believe that, without a resurrection, "the dead know not anything."

W. L.

## THE PROXIMITY OF THE KINGDOM.

### A. F.'s SECOND PAPER.

I AM not satisfied with the replies of J. C. to my questions. He says "mello" like many other words seems to have more than one meaning, and this seeming he calls "the simple fact." I should have liked a sample of the "many other words" which have a plurality of meaning; specially if they were common verbs of our own language. However, we are plainly told that mello denotes future certainty, when God makes use of it through his inspired servants. I hope there are few of the readers of the *Messenger* who will endorse such a sentiment. If words when spoken by God were to mean one thing, and the same words when spoken by men were to mean another thing, then the Bible would not be worth the paper it is printed on. What reliance can be put on God's word if we have a doubt about its meaning? And if verbs, which are the most important of all words, have not one primary and definite meaning, there can be no rational faith nor obedience exercised.

J. C. has made an improper use of the "Polymicrian Lexicon," by quoting a very small part out of the centre, and making it appear as the meaning: whereas the Polymicrian in its preface lays down the following rules for its own guidance—"In defining the words, those significations are placed first which are either primary or accord with Greek usage; and then follow, in regular gradation, the derivative senses, whether tropical, metaphorical, &c., or those which

arise from the Hebrew idiom, or depend solely on the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament writers." With these rules before us, let us turn over to mello and see what is the primary meaning; here it is—"to be about to do," "be on the point of doing." There are no derivatives given, so that the garbled extract of J. C. follows; which does not give the meaning, but only the words which represent mello in the English translation; then follow the participle form, which I transcribe, thus, "to come, future, Matth. iii. 7, Luke xiii. 9, and in other texts; to be always, as it were, about to do, to delay, linger, Acts xxii. 16."

I now leave the reader to judge the value of the simple fact of what meaning mello seems to have; and I will now state some facts about its meaning: I have been at great pains, searching the best authorities I could get these two weeks past. The word is used and applied to what is *impending*, or what may be *imminent*, and hence there is not a Greek lexicon which does not give "to be about to," "to be on the point of" doing, as its radical meaning. Mello has no corresponding word in our language; and that is the reason why it is so variously rendered. It does not have a variety of meanings; it has one uniform signification, but our English language cannot exactly express it, hence our translators have been obliged to leave it out altogether (Acts xiii. 34, xxiii. 30). And while the notion of futurity is inherent

in this verb, as it is also in our verb *to hope*, it does not on that account have any relation to certainty—as J. C. has affirmed. There is no certainty about *mello*, even when used by God's inspired servants: as an instance, look at the last quoted from the "Polymician," "Why *tarryest* thou." There can be no future certainty in *tarrying*. See also Matth. xi. 14, "And if ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come." Here *mello* is represented by the words "*which was for*," and the idea of future certainty is utterly excluded. I do not think it possible to produce a clearer instance, which could more effectually contradict the statement of J. C., that this word "always denotes future certainty when used by God through his inspired servants." I therefore conclude that the answer to my first question is both illusive and untrue.

With regard to the supports of No. 2. It is not correct to say, "the words *SHALL COME* here represent *mello*." And the argument that Jesus did not always use *mello* in speaking of his death goes for very little; in the very next chapter (Matth. xvii. 12) he does make use of it regarding his sufferings. The argument that there could not be nearness understood concerning the coming of the Son of man, so long as three important events

had to intervene, is of no force against Paul's announcement of the day of judgment, some twenty years after all these events were fulfilled. Besides, these three events were accomplished in less than sixty days, and they did not stand in the way of Jesus proclaiming "The kingdom of God is at hand," although he well knew that kingdom could not come until more than sixty days were gone by.

The bold assumption of J. C. in the February number, that there was no proximity in Paul's announcement of the day of judgment, led me to put the questions, with the hope that he might be led to retract it to some extent. His replies convince me of the inutility of continuing the subject. I feel myself unfit to cope with him. I referred to the Diaglott, because many readers of the *Messenger* possess it, and it is free from bias on the subject of proximity. I had held it in contempt since ever I saw its first number, and read Matth. iii. 2: but since seeing it frequently of late I now come to like some parts of it very much. It is a great deal better than I had thought. If I have adduced a questionable authority it was not the Diaglott, but J. C. I adduced.

A F.

## THE LITTLE HORN.

### SATAN.

IN the paper which we submit to the consideration of the reader, we would ask his attention to a few statements of scripture relative to Satan: making it rather a continuation of the one on "miracles," than dependent solely on itself.

It is stated in Rev. xii.; "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his messengers fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his messengers, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in the heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, *that old serpent, the accuser (diabolos), and the adversary (6 satanas), which deceiveth the whole habitable: he was cast out into the earth, and his messengers were cast out with*

him." The article *the* is supplied in this passage, as it occurs in the original.

Various titles are here given—the great dragon—the old serpent—the accuser—the adversary, to one and the same person. Person? Why, there is no such thing, it will be said, as a personal adversary, independent of, and not to be identified with, man; or, supernatural. The question thus raised is a simple one. It is this, is "the accuser" or "adversary," a principle or a person? Or, is the accuser sin in the flesh, seen embodied in man; or, briefly, human nature?

Before inquiring into the teaching of any other portions of the scripture, let us notice other statements

in this chapter xii. of the Revelation. At the 10th verse, it begins, "And I heard a loud voice in the heaven, saying, Now is come the salvation, and the power, and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of his Anointed: *for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them (or, the one accusing) before our God day and night. And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb,*" &c. And, in the 12th verse, "*Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.*"

If the accuser and his messengers in these passages mean human natural dignities, then the powers antagonistic to the accuser, must be of the same kind. Yet, the scripture student cannot easily perceive how they can be human dignities, when *after they have been cast out of the heaven, woe is declared to have come to the inhabitants of the earth, because the accuser has come down to them. Unless it be asserted, and not proven, that human dignities exist in the heaven. Why come down to the earth, if already present only there?*

Nor can Michael and his messengers be the saints on earth under a head. Or, human dignities be their representatives. *Because, after the accuser is cast down, he (the dragon) gives his power to the beast; and this beast, after receiving this power, makes war with the saints, and overcomes them* (Rev. xiii. 9, compare Dan. vii. 25). This is exactly the reverse of the statement of the xii. chapter of Revelation. And yet it is a statement of an event *subsequent* to the one in Rev. xii. Strange that the saints should overcome in this expositor's heaven-on-earth, and be soon afterwards overcome them-

selves on earth. But, there is not one word in these passages, to inform us, *that the saints were cast out of the heaven in order to be overcome on the earth by the dragon-energized beast.*

Again, other passages of scripture teach us, that Michael is *not* a human person, or embodied principle. In Dan. x. 13, it says, "Michael, one of the chief princes came to help me." and verse 2, "and there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince." In Dan. xii. 1, "and at that time shall Michael stand up," &c. And, Jude 9, "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the accuser." Michael, like Gabriel (Dan. viii. 16, ix. 21; Luke i. 19, 26), surely is one of that company who stand in the presence of God; and, who, as scripture abundantly testifies, are employed by him as messengers to this earth, and are not of it.

So also with regard to the accuser and his messengers. Let us turn to Matth. xxv. 31-46. At the coming of the Son of man with the holy messengers, the sheep, or the righteous, stand at his right hand, the goats, or the wicked, at his left. The former are rewarded with everlasting life; the latter, are commanded to depart into everlasting fire, which is said to have been prepared, *not for them, but for the accuser and his messengers.* So that, whatever or whoever, the accuser and his messengers may be, it is certain that he and they *are not human beings.* If they are, then the holy messengers, that come with the Son of man, are human beings also. That is to say, "the holy messengers," spoken of in verse 31, are the same persons named "the righteous," in verse 37; and "the accuser and his messengers," of verse 41, are those named "the cursed," in the

same verse, previously. Further, if "the accuser" is nothing else than a human being, then must "the Son of man" be nothing else than a human person also. Such is the position, which deniers of the existence of "the accuser" independent of man, must consistently take. And such position is entirely at variance with the teaching of this passage of scripture.

Let the reader next notice the principal features in "the temptation," after comparing the accounts given in Matthew iv.; Mark i.; and Luke iv. Jesus is conducted into the wilderness by the spirit to be tempted by "the accuser," says Matthew and Luke, (upo tou diabolon), or, by the adversary, (upo tou satana), says Mark. At the conclusion of the temptations, "the accuser," (o diabolos, Matthew and Luke; satana, Matthew iv. 10), leaves him, and the messengers come and minister to him, (Matthew and Mark). In this narrative we have three distinct personalities present, —Jesus, the accuser, and the messengers. Jesus was a human being, certainly. Was the accuser? If so, *who was he?* If so, who were the messengers? They must have been human also, for, denial of "supernatural" existence of one, involves denial of "supernatural" existence of the other. You admit existence of messengers obedient to the will of God, and *not* human. Why deny existence of the accuser as a non-human being; as there are such in existence. Say these messengers were human, then *who* were they, and those mentioned in John i. 51, and various other passages. But, let it be noted, that, in the account of the temptation, there is not the slightest hint of the presence of any other person in the flesh than Jesus himself. By what authority then are we to con-

clude, that "the accuser" was other than a person not of or in the flesh? Again, it is said of Judas, "and after the sop, the adversary entered into him." (John xiii. 27, o satanas; Luke xxii. 3, satanas). Judas was human nature, or, in him, sin was embodied. *If* the adversary or the accuser is sin embodied or human nature also, are we to understand in this matter of fact account, that human nature, or sin embodied *entered into itself?* Such must be the way this occurrence is to be understood, if the accuser is not a person. And, if this be so, how could or did satan enter into himself, or, in other words, Judas into himself?

The only consistent ground deniers of the existence of "the accuser," or "satan," as a person independent of human nature, can take is, either that of the Sadducees of past ages, or the Rationalists of the present. It is said in Acts xxiii. 8, "For indeed the Sadducees say, there is no resurrection, nor angel, nor spirit." And one of the most recent writers of the Rationalistic school makes the following statement: "Jesus on this point differed in no respect from his companions. He believed in the devil, whom he regarded as a kind of evil genius," (reference given in proof of this, Matt. vi. 13), "and he imagined, like all the world, that nervous maladies were produced by demons, who possessed the patient and agitated him. The marvellous was not the exceptional for him, it was his normal state. The notion of the supernatural, with its impossibilities, is coincident with the birth of experimental science. The man who is strange to all ideas of physical laws, who believes that by praying he can change the path of the clouds, arrest disease, and even death, finds nothing extraordinary in miracles, inasmuch as the entire course of things is to him

the result of the freewill of the Divinity. This intellectual state was constantly that of Jesus." And again, "In him" (Jesus) "was condensed all that is good and elevated in our nature. He was not sinless; he has conquered the same passions that we combat; no angel of God comforted him, except his good conscience; no satan tempted him, except that which each one bears in his heart."\* Comment is needless. We are content to say, that the position taken by this writer opposed to scripture teaching as it is, is the only consistent one that can be taken by the deniers of the "supernatural," and "its impossibilities," *so called*.

But, it is said, that, by alleging the existence of such an accusing spirit, we make God copartner with him, and to have created enormous multitudes of mankind for no other destiny than eternal torment. This is, however, only another infidel argument, in a slightly modified shape. Infidels allege, that God cannot be a merciful, loving, or good being, to condemn multitudes of mankind to eternal torments, because the first human pair committed sin by eating the fruit of a tree, and for this cause, punishing others, not guilty of this act, with death. Whatever answer it may be, they, who say they are of the faith, would give to this infidel statement, it will be also the answer which we would give in reply to the reason of the existence of the accuser. It is certain, that no scripture teaches, that any of human family were ever destined to eternal fire or torments; yet, it is equally certain, that the scripture does teach that the wicked will depart into fire age-lasting, which *was prepared for the accuser and his messengers*.

If human nature, or sin's flesh, are *the same* as the accuser; then, in other words, they must be interchangeable. In any passage, we should be able to substitute the one for the other, without any violation of its sense. Let us take one. Heb. ii. 14-16; "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of the accuser, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, human nature; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of messengers (what kind of messengers are these?) but he took on him the accuser." In this instance "flesh and blood," and "the seed of Abraham," being human nature, are also the accuser, and "the devil" is also human nature. We think a few trials of this interchangeable method will be sufficient to prove whether the accuser is human nature or not.

Much more might be written upon this subject: should future opportunity present itself, we will give a list of the occurrences of the words, the accuser, the adversary, accusers, prince of the power of the air, and so on. For the present, we would notice, that the Hebrew word, rendered devils in Levit xvii. 7; Deut. xxxii. 17; 2 Chron. xi. 15; Psalm cvi. 37; Isa. xiii. 21, and xxxiv. 14, should have been translated goats.

The statements made in the Revelation are as follows:

The accuser or the dragon gives his power and his throne, and great authority, to the antichrist, or the Little Horn, who makes war against the saints for a short season, or forty-two months. Rev. xii. xiii.

The accuser, or the dragon, or the old serpent, or the adversary, is bound for a thousand years, Rev. xx.

\* "Life of Jesus," by Ernest Renan—59. 60, 310.

The adversary or the accuser is loosed at the end of the thousand years, deceives the nations, but his power is terminated by being cast into the lake of fire. Rev. xx. CHRISTIANOS.

## IS THE PROXIMITY OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD THE "GOSPEL" PREACHED BY JESUS?

THIS is a subject which has perplexed the minds of a few of the brethren this good number of years; and consequently requires a strict investigation, before we accept or reject it. I presume, that we have all experience enough now, or ought to have at least, to understand that, in the investigation of such subjects, our only sure guide is to compare one part of scripture with another; and not to base a theory upon one or two texts, about which there is great room for doubt as to their real meaning.

With regard to the *gospel* preached by Jesus and his apostles to Jew and Gentile, being expressed in the sentence "The kingdom of God is at hand," I find that a writer, L. has written largely upon the subject. But upon examination of L's writings, I think it is evident, that he is sadly perplexed himself in the matter, for his proofs are very meagre, and ill to the point. His principal proof is Mark i. 14, 15. "Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God; and saying, the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel." This he calls a "standard proof text," and considers it a *sure and clear proof* that the gospel preached by Jesus at first, is the good news that the kingdom of God is at hand. He insists that the phrase "and saying" is explanatory of what precedes it; or in other words, that "preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God," is just saying, "the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." He denies that the two latter propositions are super-added to the preaching of the *gospel of the kingdom* as an impetus or warning to repentance; and cites Mat. xix. 3; Mat. xxii. 35, 36; Luke ii. 13; Luke iv. 41, as parallel cases in which the phrase "and saying" is used explanatory of what precedes it. He asks,—is there any scripture where the phrase, standing as it does in the above scriptures, is used as introducing something additional, and not as explanatory of what precedes it? To this I answer, *undoubtedly there is*

In Matt. iii. 1, 2, we read,—“In these days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, repent ye

for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” Did John the Baptist preach the gospel of the kingdom? I, without hesitation say, he did not! as I hope to prove. What was it then, that John preached? Let us turn to Luke iii. 3, and there we shall see that the subject of John's preaching was, "THE BAPTISM OF REPENTANCE FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS." This is explicit: there is no room for mistake here. It is evident that the saying, "Repent ye for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," is but a mere superaddition to the *preaching*, as an impetus, or warning for the people then to receive this "*baptism of repentance*," and so prepare themselves for the manifestation of him of whom John was the precursor.

I have already asserted that John the Baptist did not preach the gospel of the kingdom of God: it remains for me now to prove this. Turning to Mark i. 14, 15, we read,—“Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God.” It is evident from this, that *John finished his mission before Jesus began his preaching*. Keeping this steadily in mind, we read in Acts x. 36, 37, and see this fact further illustrated and confirmed. Mark well the words of Peter.—“The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ, (he is Lord of all). That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached.” See also Heb. ii. 3. It is certain from this, that Jesus began to preach a certain "word" in Galilee after John had finished his mission; and it is further evident, that this word had not been previously preached in that age by any one else. Now, the question is, what "word" is this? Paul calls it "the great salvation which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord himself." No one amongst us will deny I think, that this "word" is, "*the gospel of the kingdom of God*." Seeing then that John the Baptist did not preach the gospel of the kingdom of God; and that he used the saying, "*the kingdom of God is at hand*," it follows that this saying, or its equivalent "*the kingdom of God is at hand*," is not the *gospel*, nor a

part of the *gospel*, but merely superadded by John and Jesus to their respective preachings, as an impetus to repentance.

Paul's definition of "*the Gospel*" in Gal. iii. 8. will not suit this *at hand gospel* theory: but L. disposes of this difficulty by simply asserting that this saying of Paul,—“in thee, (Abraham), shall all nations be blessed,” is only gospel in a secondary sense. A writer (J. C.) in the Messenger has well observed this assumption, which observation, has called forth the following from L.—“One may ask, what then do you make of Gal. iii. 8? Does not Paul here define the gospel to be the blessing of the nations in Abraham? Paul says that this good message was preached before to Abraham. That is before he was circumcised, as in the paralled passage of Rom. iv. But the question is not, what is the good message preached so long ago to Abraham; but what is the gospel or good message which God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son?” We have here two assumptions. The first is,—“preached before the gospel unto Abraham,” means before Abraham was circumcised. This is not an assumption that involves any great consequence, that I can see at present, but not so with the second. L. has never attempted to prove the assumption which J. C. has observed; but seems to think he should get out of the difficulty by further asserting, that the gospel preached so long ago to Abraham, is not the question with us. But I maintain that it is the question with which we have to do; for if the gospel preached by Christ and his apostles be a different gospel from that preached to Abraham, it is evident we must have a different faith from that of Abraham. It is further evident, that if

we do not have the same faith that Abraham had, we cannot be his *seed* and heirs, according to the promise made to him and his seed. Has God made any other promise to man?

Let us now compare the gospel preached to Abraham with that preached by Jesus, and see if we can identify them. The gospel preached to Abraham is summarily comprised in the sentence,—“In thee shall all nations be blessed.” The question then is, what is the nature and extent of this blessing? I dare say it will be admitted by all of us, that it is a complete deliverance of the human race from the evils to which it is now subjected, even death itself: and a deliverance of the earth from the curse brought upon it by the disobedience of Adam. Or, in other words,—The great salvation which God has in store for the earth, and for man. In Heb. ii. 3. Paul speaks of a *great salvation* which began to be spoken by the Lord himself. This is none else than the *great salvation* which is set before us in the gospel of the kingdom of God, which is a complete deliverance, to all who will receive it, from the bondage of corruption to enjoy the glorious liberty of the sons of God; and to be constituted nation-blessers with Abraham; and a deliverance of the whole creation from the bondage of corruption under which it now groans. This is “The great salvation which God has in store for the earth, and for man.” Thus we see that the *gospel* preached to Abraham, and the *gospel* preached by Christ and his apostles, are one and the same gospel. I sincerely hope that L. will candidly consider what I have said; and that he will see that the view he has taken of the at hand matter is erroneous.

Glasgow.

J. L.

SACRED CRITICISM.

From Gausson's "*Theopneustia*."

Learning is a doorkeeper who conducts you to the temple of the scriptures. Never forget, then, that she is not the God, and that her house is not the temple. In other terms, when you study sacred criticism, beware of keeping to that, even as regards learning. She leaves you in the street; you must enter. And now for the argument.

If you penetrate, in fact, into the sanctuary of the scriptures, then not

only will you find inscribed by the hand of God on all its walls that God fills it, and that he is everywhere there, but, further, you will receive the proof of it experimentally. There you will behold him everywhere; there you will feel him everywhere. In other terms, when one reads God's oracles with care, he not only meets with the frequent declaration of their entire inspiration but, further, through unexpected



strokes, and often through a single verse or the power of a single word, he receives a profound conviction of the divinity stamped upon it throughout.

As regards advice, it must not be imagined that we have given it with the view of discrediting learned investigations; we offer it, on the contrary, in their interest, and in order to their completion. In fact, it too often happens that a prolonged course of study, devoted to the extrinsic parts of the sacred book (its history, its manuscripts, its versions, its language), by entirely absorbing the attention of the men who give themselves to it, leaves them inattentive to its more intrinsic attributes, its meaning, its object, the moral power which displays itself there, the beauties that reveal themselves there, the life that diffuses itself there. And as there exist, nevertheless, necessary relations between these essential attributes and those exterior forms, two great evils result from this pre-occupation of the mind. By this absorption the student stifles his spiritual life as a man, and compromises final salvation. This, however, is not the evil we have to do with in these pages: as a learned inquirer, he compromises his science by it, and renders himself incapable of forming a sound estimate of the very objects of his studies. His learning is wanting in coherence and consistency, and from that very cause becomes contracted and creeping. How can a man become acquainted with the temple, when he has seen but the stones, and knows nothing of the Shekinah? Can the types be understood, when he has not even a suspicion of their anti-type? he has seen but altars, sheep, knives, utensils, blood, fire, incense, costumes, and ceremonies; he has not beheld the world's redemption,

futurity, heaven, the glory of Jesus Christ! And, in this state, he has been unable so much as to comprehend the relations which these external objects have amongst themselves, because he has not comprehended their harmony with the whole.

A learned man, without faith, living in the days of Noah, who had studied the structure of the ark, would have lost his soul, no doubt; but, further, he would have remained ignorant of a great part of the very objects which he pretended to appreciate.

Suppose that a Roman traveller in the days of Pompey the Great had wished to describe Jerusalem and its temple. Arriving in the city on a Sabbath-day, he repairs to the holy place with his guide; he makes the tour of it; he admires its enormous stones; he measures its positions; he inquires about its antiquity and the names of the architects; he passes through its gigantic gates, which two hundred men daily open at sunrise and shut again at noon; there he sees, arriving by thousands, in regular order, the Levites and choristers in their linen habits; and while in the interior, the sons of Aaron perform their rites; while the psalms of the prophet king resound under the sacred vaults, and thousands of choristers, accompanying them with their instruments, respond to each other in their sublime antiphonies; while the law is read, the word preached, and the souls that look for the consolation of Israel are lifted up with delight to the glories that are invisible, and filled with the deepest awe in contemplating that God "with whom there is plenteous redemption;" while aged Simeons are raising their thoughts to "that glorious salvation unceasingly waited for;" while sinners are turning to God; while more

than one poor publican strikes upon his breast; while more than one poor widow, with joyous emotion, takes out her two mites for God's treasury; and while so many invisible and ardent prayers are rising towards heaven;—what may we suppose our traveller to be doing? Why, counting the pillars, admiring the pavements, measuring the courts, scrutinising the congregation, taking drawings of the altar of incense, the candlestick, the table of shewbread, the golden censer; after which, he walks off, mounts to the battlements of the fortress, goes down to the Xystus and to the brook Kedron, makes the circuit of the walls, counting his steps as he goes, and then returns to his quarters, there to write out his observations and to prepare

his book. No doubt, he might boast of his having seen the Hebrew nation and their worship and temple; he might publish his journey, and find numerous readers; but, even with respect to the scientific knowledge which his book is meant to diffuse, how many errors of judgment will be found in it! and how many errors would the worshippers in the temple have to refute in it!

Here, then, is the advice we proffer, in the sole interests of your theological learning. It necessarily follows, from the necessary relations that subsist betwixt the eternal ends contemplated by God in his Word and its external forms, that, in order to judge correctly of the latter, you must first have made yourself acquainted with the former.

### Intelligence, Notes, &c.

**BROOKLYN, U. S.**—We do not think confidence is in any way violated by yielding to the request of some brethren, and publishing the following extract from a letter of brother James Forman's,—“I was glad to see ‘the Rochester address’ in the *Messenger*; and that it was fully endorsed by the church. I think the beautiful spirit of that address should be carried out. It really is time that those bickerings were done away, and the effect of the gospel of peace were tried on the alienated world. The longer I live, and the more I see of the character of God revealed in his works and in his word the more I am persuaded that it is the *goodness* of God that bringeth men to repentance, and that the opposite course estranges. Our little meeting in Brooklyn goes on and prospers, and no root of bitterness has sprung up among us—we keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Our minds and hopes are set upon the glorious appearing of our elder brother from the far country, and believe he will soon come to build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down. Our number is about 16—we meet every first day, to worship, and memorialize the death of the Messiah.”

**DUNDEE.**—“Robert Cameron, (mason, 202 Perth Road); John Menzies, (mason), and his wife (Ure Street), on confessing their faith in the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ were

baptized on 27th April, and on Sunday 29th were added to the church—May they be preserved, soul, body, and spirit, blameless unto the coming of the Lord.” D. W.

**EDINBURGH.**—During the past month we have received from Aberdeen, brother and sister Alexander Black, who have come to reside with their family in the city. In balance of this accession, brother Alexander Davie has removed to Dundee, to be followed by sister Davie as soon as her health will permit. Brother Robert Archibald has also moved to Innerleithen, Peeblesshire.

**GLASGOW.**—“On Sunday the 12th May, James Pettigrew, of Benhour Oil Works, (near Crofthead), was immersed, and added to the church here, his wife (a daughter of D. Culbert, once well known among the brethren in the west); intends soon to follow his example, and would indeed have accompanied him but for bad health. May she soon be able to obey the dictates of her conscience, when by so doing she follows the will of the Lord.” C. E. G.

**HALIFAX, N. S.**—Brother George Kerr, (from Tranent, Scotland), has arrived at his destination in safety; he is reported to be “quite hearty after his long and stormy voyage.”

**LIVERPOOL.**—“Dear Brother Dowie, I sail to-morrow (May 22), in the steam ship *Marathon*, (Cunard line). She seems clean,

and shows some attempt at ventilation, which, to say the least, is not always the case. I think any brother passing through Barrow-in-Furness will find a friend of truth in John Barrow, blacksmith, Church Street."—G. Westgarth. Thus has terminated the short residence of brother Westgarth in England. We presume he returns to Illinois.

TURRIFF.—“Dear brother, once more I take up my pen to give you a few lines of intelligence. After being very poorly for some weeks, and making no progress in strength, I arranged to go to Buchan among the brethren, to see if I would improve, and might do them some good. The following is the result:—My health is much improved, after three weeks' stay, during which time I lectured *eight* times, and offered *three* exhortations on Sundays 8th, 15th, 22d of April. On the afternoon of the 8th I baptized Euphemia Fraser; after which she had to forsake father and mother so as to save her life; but, having cleaved to the Lord with full purpose of heart, she immediately found a home among the brethren, and is now engaged for the summer six months. She is sixteen years of age, and, like Nicodemus, I taught her by night, when she was here with her sister Mrs W. Harvey. The same week I baptized Ann Clark. (youngest daughter of brother J. Clark of Balfaton), she has been favourably disposed to the truth for some time, but could not intelligently make it her own until I taught her in company with the former, her age is fourteen, the youngest I have baptized. These were both received into fellowship on the 15th April. On the 6th of May, Helen Clark, (another daughter of brother Clark's) was baptized here, at Turriff, and the same day received into the fellowship of the church. These all go on their way rejoicing. The brethren are refreshed, and I have the comfort of hope that there may be yet a few more additions soon, as the result of the good seed, the word of the kingdom, sown on former occasional visits; and may therefore realise to some extent the saying that is written “He that goeth forth

and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him.” J. R.

THE BRETHREN ARE REMINDED that the circumstances of brother James Robertson, (37 Chapel Street), Turriff, are still straitened, the ill health referred to above, as well as much more he has had before, indicates also poverty; by this time his rent should have been paid. Help, either directly, or through our treasurer, will be very thankfully received.

The Treasurer acknowledges receipts for the Messenger from Birmingham, Bradford-on-Avon, Halifax, N. S., Liverpool, Turriff.

## Publications.

### THE DISCIPLES' CHORAL SERVICE OF BIBLE THEMES,

A collection of Christian Songs,—the subjects selected from the Holy Scriptures, and set to suitable music (in both notations), arranged for four voices. This book, got up expressly for the use of the brethren in their social services, and suitable either for the church or the fireside,

*Is now reduced in price.*

One Shilling in a neat printed cover; One and Sixpence cloth boards, post free. May be had of G. Dowie, 12 Beaumont Place, Edinburgh.

*Also may be had of G. DOWIE,*

THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES,

1st SERIES.

*A few copies are retained in hand for a short time longer, and can be supplied to the brethren at the price before announced, viz:—The four volumes, 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864, stitched and in paper covers, 1s. each; or the four in one volume, cloth lettered, 4s. 6d. Postage of single vols. 2d. of cloth vols 6d. vol. 1, (1860) is imperfect; but single numbers of 4-12, may be had at one penny each.*

THE MESSENGER IS REGISTERED FOR TRANSMISSION ABROAD.

THE PRICE OF THE MESSENGER is 2d. a Number, or by post to any part of Great Britain, United States, or the Colonies, 3d. When four or more Nos. are taken they are supplied post free in Britain.

Articles should be sent in by the 15th of the month, and items of intelligence not later than the 24th; all papers meant for insertion, or notes of intelligence, may be forwarded to GEORGE DOWIE, 12 Beaumont Place; and all business communications to JAMES CAMERON, 14 Calton Hill, Edinburgh, to whom money orders should be made payable.

# THE MESSENGER OF THE CHURCHES.

" I SPEAK AS TO WISE MEN, JUDGE YE WHAT I SAY."

No. 7.

JULY 1, 1866.

NEW SERIES. VOL. II.

## THE LORD'S PROPHECY.

WE here present, for the readers' attentive perusal, a harmonized account of the prophecy of our Lord, contained in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, the thirteenth chapter of Mark, and the twenty-first chapter of Luke.

And Jesus went out, and departed from the temple, and his disciples came to him for to shew him the buildings of the temple, and some spoke, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts; and one of his disciples saith unto him, Master, see what manner of stones and what buildings are here! And Jesus answering, saith unto him, See ye not all these things? these great buildings? Verily I say unto you, as for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in the which there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.

And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, over against the temple, the disciples, Peter and James and John and Andrew come unto him privately, and asked him, saying, Master, but tell us, when shall these things be, and what the signs when all these things shall come to pass, and be fulfilled; And what the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the age? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am the anointed, and the time draweth near, and shall deceive many. Go ye not, therefore, after them. And ye shall hear of wars, and rumours of wars. And when ye shall hear of wars, and rumours of wars, and commotion, see that ye be not terrified or troubled: for all these things must first come to pass, but the end is not yet.

Then saith he unto them, nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and great earthquakes shall be in divers places; and there shall be famines, pestilences, and troubles; and fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven. All these are the beginning of sorrows.

But take heed to yourselves! For before all these, they shall lay their hands on you, and persecute you, and deliver you up to councils, and to the synagogues, and into prisons, to be afflicted; and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten; and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my name's sake; and they shall kill you: and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake, and it shall turn to you for a testimony against them. But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak. But whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye: for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit. Settle ye, therefore, in your hearts, not to premeditate to make a defence. For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and hate one another. Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son; and children shall rise up against their parents, and shall cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be betrayed both by parents, and kinsfolks, and friends; and some of you they will put to death. But there shall not a hair of your head perish. In your patience possess ye your souls. And many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many, and because the lawlessness will abound, the love of the many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end,

the same shall be saved: and this glad tidings of the kingdom shall be preached in all the habitable, for a testimony unto all nations, and then shall the end come.

And when ye, therefore, shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh, and the abomination of the desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not, in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand), then let them which be in Judea flee unto the mountains; and let them which are in the midst of it depart out, and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto; and let him which is on the housetop not come down into the house, neither enter, to take anything out of his house; and let him that is in the field not turn back again for to take up his garment. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! And pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the sabbath day. For in those days shall be great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the creation which God created unto this time, no, nor ever shall be. For there shall be great distress in the land, affliction and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations. And Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. And except that the Lord had shortened those days there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen, those days shall be shortened. And then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is the anointed; or, lo, there; believe not. For there shall arise false anointed ones, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive even the chosen. But take ye heed; behold, I have foretold you all things, wherefore if they shall say unto you, behold, he is in the desert, go not forth; behold, in the secret chambers, believe not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. For whosoever the carcase is, there will the eagles be gathered together.

But immediately after the tribulation of those days there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars. The sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from the heavens; and upon the earth shall be distress of nations with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them from fear and expectation of the things coming on the habitable. For the powers of

the heaven will be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in the heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of the heaven with power and great glory. And then shall he send his messengers with a great sound of a trumpet and they shall gather together his chosen from the four winds, from the one end of heaven to the other, from the uttermost part of the earth to the uttermost part of heaven. And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh. And he spake to them a parable: Now learn a parable of the fig tree; behold the fig tree, and all the trees; when its branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand. So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand; at the doors. Verily I say unto you, that this generation shall not pass away, till all these things be fulfilled. The heaven and the earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the messengers of the heavens, neither the Son, but my Father only.

But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken away, and the other left. Two shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken away, and the other left. And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and anxieties of life, and that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye therefore, take ye heed, and pray always; that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man. For ye know not when the time is, or what hour your Lord doth come. Therefore be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh. He is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to his servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. Who then is the faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed that servant, whom his lord when

he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, that he shall make him ruler over all his goods. But, and if that servant shall say in his heart, my lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to smite the fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken: the lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.\* Watch ye therefore, for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the

cock-crowing, or in the morning: lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch.

Then follows the parable of the ten virgins, **Matthew xxv. 1-13.** Next, the parable of the talents, **Matthew xxv. 14-30.** Concluding with the description of the Son of Man coming in his glory, to judge; **Matthew xxv. 31-46.** This prophecy being delivered a few days before His crucifixion, **Matthew xxvi. 1, 2.**

\* For this harmonised statement the writer is indebted to many writers and translators: Adam Clarke, Samuel Dunn, John Brown, Samuel Sharpe, Nathaniel Scarlett and Benjamin Wilson.

C.

## THE PERSONALITY OF SATAN.

This topic has been chosen for remark in the present case, not because it is of peculiar interest, or regarded as of paramount importance, in the estimation of the writer. It has been to him for a good many years a subject surrounded with great difficulties. The arguments for, and against the personality of the Devil, or Satan, have been frequently weighed by him, with the result that he finds it much easier to urge objections against both, than to satisfy himself with arguments for either. This much, however, must be acknowledged, that the language of Scripture, in many instances, seems unable to sustain, if fairly treated, the non-personal view, yet that language needs only to be *quoted*, to state the idea, that the devil is a person. Indeed, it is impossible to express the non-personal view in the simple language of the Bible, while it seems, simply, to *express* the opposite. It is because of this circumstance, that the writer is prepared in the meantime to accept the latter view, with all its difficulties, as the scriptural one. Still our mind is not so satisfied as on other scrip-

tural truths; we wait for light, and shall be glad to be put in possession of solid reasons, either in confirmation of what we hold, or reject. The question has never appeared to us of much practical importance: so long as the Lord Jesus Christ is believed in as the destroyer of sin; and the vanquisher of all evil beings—so long as there exists a determination to crucify the flesh—to be separate from all sin, and eschew all inducements to evil, it seems to us of little practical moment whether the devil of scripture be a *person* or a *principle*.

Of late, however, this question has received an importance of the first magnitude, among brethren in certain quarters: so much so, that the belief that the devil of scripture is a person, is thought to nullify any faith a person may have regarding the kingdom of God, or the Lord Jesus Christ. Brethren have been denied the amenities of christian fellowship, because, in addition to their believing these things, they hold that the Satan of the Bible is not a principle, but a person. Without passing any verdict on the propriety of such conduct, in the meantime, it may be per-

mitted us to say, that it surely becomes those who attach so much importance to belief in the non-personality of the devil, to demonstrate that idea from the scriptures; not merely giving interpretations of scripture in favour of their own idea, but, also, patiently and candidly, examining those passages which are supposed to teach that the devil is a being; and show how the use of such language can be otherwise accounted for. This we have not seen fairly, and fully done. The latest attempt at this sort of thing, we have seen, presented itself to us in the form of a pamphlet, bearing the sensational, if not elegant, title of "The Devil and Hell."\* There is much in the pamphlet with which we agree; and it is only in so far as it relates to the non-personality of the devil, that we have to do with it in the meantime. The author avers that it is not from "a wish to gratify sceptical or vulgar ambition," but "the settled conviction of the vast consequences of right or wrong understanding, relative to the devil and hell, that has induced" him to call attention to these matters. It was therefore with some interest and expectancy we turned to his demonstration; but the result has been far from satisfactory. The author has allowed his native turn for humour to blunt his causality, so that his remarks have more *fun* than *force* in them; and his performance seems open to the charge of flippancy.

Setting out with the assumption, that the devil of scripture is not a person, but a principle, the writer of the pamphlet honestly acknowledges that it is "imperative" on him "to appeal to those particular passages whence the devil-theory is

said to spring." The manner in which he discharges this "imperative" duty is somewhat astonishing. The first passage he puts up is Jude, verse 6th, "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."

On these words he remarks:—

"The word 'reserved' presents the idea that these angels are still alive, and will at some future day come up for judgment. The original text, however, conveys no such impression. It declares that Jehovah has kept them with, or consigned them to, *perpetual* chains, under thick or intense darkness. How can they ever be released from 'perpetual bonds?' How can they ever rise to judgment from the *perpetual* chains of death, in the 'thick darkness' of which they are kept? From this, and that passage in 2 Peter, ii. 4, it is inferred that the devil was one (the chief) of these disobedient angels therein mentioned. But this cannot be, seeing that they all are in perpetual death, or in other words, for ever put out of existence. Wherever, therefore, the king of the lake of burning brimstone may come from, it is evident his descent is not from the angels spoken of by Jude and Peter." p. 7.

In a prefatory note the author acknowledges his "indebtedness to John Thomas, M.D." for enabling him "to set before the public the things contained" in his pamphlet; but the foregoing extract must have been drawn from another source. It asserts boldly that these angels are not reserved unto judgment at some future day; but are already "*for ever put out of existence*"; while the verdict of Dr Thomas is, that they shall be "judged in the day of Christ"; for he has written:—

"But what is to become of the Evil Angels in everlasting chains of darkness, and who shall be their judge? Jude says, they were committed, 'for the Judgment of the Great Day.' He alludes to this great day in his quotation of the prophecy of Enoch, saying, 'Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his Holy Ones (angels of his might, 1 Thess. 1. 7.) to execute judgment

\* The Devil and Hell; By Edward Turney: Nottingham. 26 pp. price 3d.

upon all,' &c. This coming of the Lord to judgment is termed by Paul 'The Day of Christ'—'a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by Jesus Christ,'—during which the saints, with angels ministering unto them, having lived again, will reign with Christ a thousand years on the earth. This is the Great Day of Judgment, a period of one thousand years, in which Christ and his saints will govern the nations righteously, and award to the rebel angels the recompense awaiting their transgression. 'Know ye not,' saith Paul, 'that we (the saints) shall judge angels? How much more things that pertain to this life?' From these data we conclude that these angels will be judged in the Day of Christ by Jesus and the saints." *Epis Israel.*, p. 10.

We think it a pity that Mr Turney has preferred his own judgment to that of Dr Thomas, in this instance, as the latter has adhered more closely to "the original text," as well as to the obvious sense of the English translation. But granting this to be the case, what is the worth of this passage as a proof that the devil, or Satan, is a being? None whatever. The term "devil" or "Satan" does not occur in the passage; and while these angels are reserved, or kept in perpetual bonds until the judgment of the great day, the devil is not to be bound till during the "thousand years," after which he is to be cast into the lake of fire. We therefore quite agree with the writer of "the Devil and Hell," that Satan is not one of the angels spoken of by Peter and Jude in the passages alluded to; and we presume that few who believe in the personality of the devil, will feel their position much weakened by the same. The other passage which our author cites as an alleged proof of the personality of Satan, is Isaiah xiv. 12, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O, Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations!" which he is at some pains to shew is spoken concerning the

king of Babylon. A simple reference to verse 4th would have been sufficient for that purpose, as the prophet is there told to "take up this proverb against the king of Babylon," of which proverb, verse 12th forms a part. These are the only passages which our author thinks fit to examine, "whence the devil-theory is said to spring." "A few other testimonies," he avers, "might be examined that are supposed to support the common devil notion;" these he dismisses by the short and easy method of asserting that they are "in reality no support at all!"

Is this fair? Does the author of this pamphlet really believe that he has discharged the imperative duty of examining the proof passages alleged by the believers in a personal devil? If so, he must be very ignorant of the arguments in favour of the theory he opposes; his reading on the subject must have been very one-sided indeed. We rather take this view of the case, as we cannot suppose that it is either through want of courage or honesty that he has entirely evaded the examination of those passages of scripture which are thought to sustain the belief that the devil of the Bible is a person. By so doing, his work must prove a failure in convincing those who are intelligently, though, it may be, mistakenly persuaded of that idea.

The same ignorance or obliviousness of what is really held by those who believe that the terms, "the devil" and "Satan" are applied in scripture to a particular being, characterises the whole of the reasoning of the pamphlet before us. Its author seems to have drawn his picture of the devil he demolishes from certain grotesque representations which are exhibited in booksellers' windows at a particular season



of the year, which have their origin in the conceits of Scandinavian mythology—not from a perusal of such writings as treat of the personality of the devil, as a doctrine of scripture. So that we can hold our belief in the personality of Satan, and yet walk along with our friend when he “ventures to affirm, that though there is a devil often spoken of in scripture, he is no relation to the gentleman above described,” p. 6.

There is yet another point on which we can agree with our author, and yet retain our belief, namely, that the devil is not *indestructible*—that he shall be destroyed. Most decisively do the scriptures speak on this point, and most cordially do we believe that the Son of God was manifested to destroy “not only” the works of the devil, but also “that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death—that is, the devil,” Heb. ii. 14, 15.

So far, then, we are at one. We agree that the two passages cited in this pamphlet as proofs of the personality of Satan, are silent on the point. We also agree that the portraits commonly given of the devil, do not belong to the person so named in scripture; and that the devil of scripture is doomed to destruction by the Son of God, who, by his obedience until death, has received a name that is above every name. Yet admitting all this, the real question at issue remains untouched. Is that which in scripture is called the devil and Satan, a person or a principle? This simple view of the matter is scarcely alluded to in this pamphlet. The shafts of the author's reasoning are almost entirely pointed against the *immortality* or *indestructibility* of the devil; so that if we erase from its pages all that is spoken against the indestructibility of the

devil, there would be little left, of argument or ridicule, against the idea of his personality.

Perhaps the author's reason for treating the question thus, is because he considers the existence of the devil to involve, necessarily, his indestructibility. He evidently does view the matter so. “The Bible,” he writes, “speaks only of two natures, one the human, the other divine. The first is corruptible, the last deathless. Seeing, then, that the devil of the Bible was not of the divine or deathless, it follows that he must be of the corruptible or human, and this conclusion is established by the mission of Jesus to destroy or put him to death,” p. 9. The logical sequence of this quotation is, *that the devil must be a human being!* We have no wish to dispute that idea at present; but that is not the conclusion which the writer wishes to be drawn. It is this—If the devil be of another order of being than the human, he *must therefore* be indestructible. This is a proposition we cannot admit on such authority. Supposing that the devil of scripture is a being—supposing him to be a wicked *angel*, how does it follow that he is indestructible? Are all beings in God's universe self-existent but man? Does not the highest order of creatures, whatever that order may be, owe its existence to God? And if he gives an angel being, and sustains that being, can he not, by his word, deprive that angel of life! Can God create super-human beings, but not destroy them? Surely not; and if not, how does it follow that if the devil be else than human, he is indestructible?

In a subsequent paragraph, the writer modifies his statement regarding the indestructibility of the devil, if he be an angel. “But how could

Jesus destroy the devil? How could mortal vanquish immortal? For the Son of God, who took not on him the nature of angels, but took on him the seed of Abraham, who was in all things made *like unto his* (mortal) *brethren*, for him, I say, to crush the devil, was absurdly impossible." These are bold startling words. We earnestly hope that the writer of them will think again; for he has written, what seems to us, dishonouring to the Son of God. It is, however, only with the logic of the statement that we have to deal. Simplified, it resolves itself into this, "Jesus was a man, therefore he cannot destroy an angel." Why not, if God empowers him to do so? And God has given to him "ALL POWER IN HEAVEN AND ON EARTH." Yea, blessed be his name for ever and ever!—This man, Christ Jesus, our brother, is, by far, superior to the angels, "He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." Already, he is exalted to a seat of honour, to which no angel shall attain—"The right hand of the Majesty on high." Angels announced his birth, and ministered to him in the days of his flesh, and when he comes again into the world "all the angels of God shall worship him." Nay more! not only he, but those of the human race, who, by his grace, are called "his brethren," shall in the age to come, "judge angels," How much more shall he, who is the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person—vanquish all the enemies of God and goodness, be they men or devils! But the Son of Man took part of flesh and blood, "that *through death* he might destroy the devil." Yea, indeed, he "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, WHEREFORE God also hath highly exalted him, and given him

a name that is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is LORD, to the glory of God the Father."

Our friend has yet something terrible in reserve for those who believe that the devil is a being: he states it thus:—

"A little consideration must convince any person of common sense, that not only was it impossible for the Son to dispatch the grim monster, but the Father himself could not put him out of existence. It is evident that the devil must have existed by the consent of God, or against his will. If by his consent, then God and the devil are friends, and there is no reason in the theory which makes God cast him out of heaven into hell, or in any way antagonize his extensive operations. But if on the other hand, he exists against His will, then it follows that God is weaker than he."

We shall readily admit that if the devil exists *against* the will, *i.e.* permission of God, then must the devil be stronger than God; but we, by no means can allow that, if God permits the devil to exist, the devil and God must be friends—If "any person of common sense" admit that, it must be because he has given the proposition very "little consideration" indeed; that is to say, unless he be an atheist. The permission of evil, and evil things, by God, has perplexed many a mind; it may seem strange to us, who are "of yesterday and know nothing," but if we believe in God, and have our eyes open, or have faith in the words of history, human and divine, we cannot help seeing that God does permit evil beings to live, and to do a fearful amount of mischief; yet we are far from believing that these workers of iniquity are in friendship with God. We feel tempted to subject the reasoning just quoted, to the *reductio ad absurdum*; but we

feel confident that the most of reflective persons will easily perceive that the reasoning of our author is as applicable to "sin in the flesh," as to sin in the devil. It matters not whether sin be perpetuated in a series of beings, or in one individual existence — the relation in which the Almighty stands to the permission of continued evil, through either of these modes is exactly the same. We have often heard the argument used by the secularist against the idea of Deity; and we felt some difficulty in satisfying

him; but fondly hope that our friend, who has faith in God and his gospel, will, on deeper thought, see that the sword he has here employed has two edges, and cuts equally keen, whether the devil of the Bible be a very long-lived person, or principle.

The space already occupied warns us to close for the present, but we trust that what we have advanced shall be of service, either in correcting wrong notions, or suggesting some thoughts more beneficial.

W. L.

### WHAT IS THE TRUE AGE OF THE WORLD?

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

A tradition is said, on good authority, to have been current among both Jews and Gentiles of ancient times, that the world should exist for 6000 years in a state of evil, to be followed by 1000 years in a state of good. This tradition appears to rest upon nothing more solid than an analogy derived from the six days of creation, followed by the seventh day of rest. It has no foundation in the scriptures, so far as the 6000 years is concerned, which is the essential part of it; as the Millenium, or 1000 years' reign of Christ and the saints, mentioned in the Revelation, is not represented as sustaining any chronological relation to the milleniums, few or many, that may have preceded it. Notwithstanding the silence of scripture regarding the subject of this human tradition, it still finds favour among writers on prophecy, from its seeming to support the doctrine concerning the

1000 years' reign, and from its supposed consistency with the commonly received age of the world, based on the Hebrew Old Testament, as being not yet 6000 years. It has even been elevated to the position of a base-line of prophetic chronology, periods and dates being interpreted so as to suit its dimensions with the greatest nicety.

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

the period from the Flood to the birth of Abraham, is, according to the Hebrew, 292 years, while according to the Septuagint, it is 1072 years, 780 years longer than the Hebrew. The difference is caused in both lists mainly by a number of the generations being just 100 years longer in the Septuagint than in the Hebrew.

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

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

In order to explain the mode in which the chronology is deduced from the data in question, it may be mentioned that Adam being, according to the Hebrew account, 130 years old at the birth of Seth, and Seth being 105 years old when Enos

was born, making the age of the world at the birth of Enos, 235 years—thus,  $130 + 105 = 235$ . According to the Septuagint, the age of the world at the birth of Adam's grandson, Enos, would be 435 years, the age of Adam at the birth of Seth being 230, and the age of Seth at the birth of Enos being 205 years.

The omission of Cainan diminishes the age of the world by 130 years, this being, according to the Septuagint, the age of Cainan at the birth of his son Sala.

From these two periods, then, the commonly received chronology is diminished by 1366 years, and the world is older by this number of years if the Septuagint is found in this point to be more reliable.

There is another period in which the commonly received chronology is shortened, even when judged by the Hebrew itself. This is the period from the Exodus to the foundation of Solomon's Temple. The marginal dates in the common version make this period extend from 1491 to 1011 before Christ, being a period of 480 years, as indeed it is expressly stated to be in 1 Kings vi. 1. Without entering minutely into this period, I content myself with stating that the *data* in the book of Judges, as to the periods of foreign servitude, and as to the intervening rule of the judges, taken in connection with Paul's statement of the total period of the judges, contained in Acts xiii. 20, make it evident that upwards of 100 years are here abridged from the true age of the world. Hence 1 Kings vi. 1. must be erroneous.

There are several circumstances mentioned in the patriarchal history which, but for the lengthened chronology contained in the Septuagint version would be very difficult of explanation. For example it is said

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

Another anomaly may be here mentioned, shewing the extreme unlikelihood of the Hebrew being free from corruption. Abraham was told, "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age." And it is recorded that he "died in a good old age, an old man and full of years." Now according to the Hebrew text Abraham died aged 175, and had for con-

temporaries—Noah 58 years, Shem 210, Arphaxad 148, Salah 178, Eber 239, Peleg 48, Reu 78, Sarug 101, representing nine preceding generations, their ages ranging from 950 down to 230 years. Nay, more, Abraham was outlived by Shem, Salah, and Eber, representing respectively the ninth, seventh, and sixth generations of his ancestors. In these circumstances it is difficult to see how Abraham could be said to die in a good old age? On the other hand, the Greek version makes Abraham the survivor of all his ancestors, and thus presents another strong collateral testimony to its own accuracy. At the same time the Greek version shews a more gradual shortening of the life of man than the Hebrew does.

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

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

The age of the world, then, may be said to be in round numbers 7500 years instead of 6000, the traditional millenium of sabbatic rest being

consequently a myth, and already numbered among the years of the past. But the old truth remains—"It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath

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

J. C.

### FAMILIAR SPIRITS.

IN Deut. xviii. 9 to 22; warning is given to the children of Israel to avoid certain practices, which other nations followed after, but which are declared to be an abomination to the Lord. Had these things a positive existence among the nations? Most assuredly, or they would not have been practised by them. The question we have to ask, is not, whether they were founded on falsehood or the truth, or a mixture of both, but, whether they actually existed. In the passage of scripture we are referring to, a list of them is given, which we will give, with other scripture references, so that the reader may decide for himself, whether they actually existed or not.

"His son or his daughter to pass through the fire"—Compare Levit. xviii. 21; 2 Kings xvi. 3; 2 Kings xxi. 6; 2 Kings xxiii. 10; Jer. xix. 5; Ezek. xx. 3.

"Or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a wizard, or a necromancer." Compare Exodus vii. 11, 22; viii. 7, 18; Gen. xli. 8; Num. xxii. 7; 1 Sam. vi. 2; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6; Daniel i. 20; ii. 2; iv. 7; v. 7; Isaiah xlv. 25; xlvii. 13; Matthew ii. 1; Acts xix. 9.

"False prophets," 15 to 22 v. Compare Deut. xiii. 1 to 5; 1 Kings xviii. 19; 1 Kings xxii. 6, 22; Ezek. xiii. 16; xiv. 9; and Zech. xiii. 1 to 5. In this last passage, it is declared, that, in that day, the Lord "will cause the prophets and the un-

clean spirits to pass out of the land."

"Or a consulter with familiar spirits." In Levit. xx. 27, it is declared, that "a man, also, or woman, that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death." In Levit. xix. 31; "Regard not them that have familiar spirits." There are two distinct parties named in these passages. On the one hand, the "consulter," "a man," or "woman," and "them." On the other, the "familiar spirit," or "spirits." It will be admitted that the first named had a positive existence. But, will it be said, that they are also the same as the second named. If so, the scripture should read, "Or a consulter who is a familiar spirit;" and, "a man, also, or woman, that is a familiar spirit;" and, "Regard not them that are familiar spirits."

In the Scripture, commonly called the New Testament, we meet with expressions, as in the following passages: Matt. x. 1, "He gave them power over unclean spirits." Matt. xii. 43, "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest and finding none; then he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out. Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there." Mark i. 23, "There was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit—and when

the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him."

Acts v. 16, "sick folks, and them which were vexed with unclean spirits;" viii. 7, "For unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, came out of many that were possessed;" xvi. 16, "A certain damsel possessed of a spirit of divination (or of Python). But Paul being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ, to come out of her;" xix. 12, "And the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits came out of them;" and, xix. 16, "and the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them." These are only a few of numerous passages to be found in the scriptures. Will it be asserted that persons possessed by unclean or evil spirits, were the unclean or evil spirits themselves. If so, why do the scriptures make a distinction between spirits and persons. The persons exist, so did the spirits, if scripture testimony is to be accepted as true.

If these spirits were the spirits of those whom they possessed, then, whenever they came out, in obedience to the command of the Lord and the apostles, the possessed would cease to live; for, the spirit of a man, according to scripture, is always to be identified with the man himself.

It is well observed by a recent writer,\* when remarking on Job, iv. 15, that, "while Eliphaz declares he saw in vision "a spirit," he does not say it was a *human spirit*, and who would affirm that "a spirit" and "a *human spirit*" are the same things?" And again, on Acts, xxiii. 9, "but if a spirit (*pneuma*) or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God." So spoke "scribes that were of the Pharisees' part,"

about Paul, but as the words contain nothing about a *human spirit*, the passage is excluded from consideration at this time," so that we are fully justified, by the testimony of scripture, in believing that familiar spirits exist, and, that it is impossible and improbable that God should make laws against that which has no positive existence.

The case of Samuel is the only one on record of a man being brought up from the dead by a consulter with familiar spirits. There is no proof that the Witch of Endor, or any similar persons ever had the power to summon the dead from their graves, so that the scripture student is not required to believe that which is not written, or to understand, that those possessed with familiar spirits, could summon the dead to answer any inquiries, at any time.

The scriptural account of Samuel's appearance is to be found in 1 Sam. xxviii. But another version, according to modern interpretation, should be substituted in its place. It runs somewhat as follows:—

"Then said the ventriloquist woman,\* "whom shall I bring up unto thee?" and he said, "bring up Samuel." And when the woman did not see Samuel, she made pretence to have brought him up, and cried with a loud voice, or screamed, and spake to Saul, pretending then to recognize him for the first time, although she must have known him from the first, saying, "why hast thou deceived me, for thou art Saul." And the king said unto her, "be not afraid; for what sawest thou?" And the woman said unto Saul; (this however being only a pretence of the woman), "I saw gods ascending out of the earth." And he said

\* The writer first saw the ventriloquist explanation, some twelve years since, in Faber's "Many Mansions of My Father's House."

\*W. G. Moncrieff, on Spirit, pp. 24, 43, 44.

unto her, "what form is he of?" and she said, knowing that Samuel did wear a mantle or robe, (as did other prophets), either from personally seeing him, or from description of others "an old man cometh up; and he is covered with a mantle." And Saul, although he perceived or knew that it was Samuel, yet did not see with his own eyes that it was Samuel, but only knew from the woman's pretended description of that which she did not see, that it was Samuel; yet he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself.

Then the ventriloquist woman, or an accomplice, imitating the voice of Samuel, whose voice she had probably not heard in her life,—and forgetting that it would appear strange to make a man, said to be brought up from the grave, ignorant of events that had transpired since his death and burial, spoke thus:—"Why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?" and Saul answered, "I am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, and God is departed from me, and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams; therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do."

The woman having thus cunningly obtained the knowledge of the matter on which Saul desired to be informed; and from her probable knowledge of the rejection of Saul, and selection of David, to be king over Israel, again imitating the voice of Samuel, said, "Wherefore then dost thou ask of me, seeing the Lord is departed from thee, and is become thine enemy? and the Lord hath done for himself, as he spake *by mine hand*; for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbour, to David; because thou obeyest not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon

Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day."

And, continued the ventriloquist woman, speaking from her probable acquaintance with the past history of Israel, and shrewdly guessing the result of a conflict between Saul's forces, and those of the Philistines, while Saul suffered under the Lord's displeasure:—"Moreover the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and at some time to come, either tomorrow or hereafter, shalt thou and thy sons be with me; the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines." And the woman, without one word of rebuke to Saul, who knew that he was under the displeasure of the Lord, and would incur his displeasure more so for consulting with familiar spirits, (which Saul himself had put down in Israel), ceased imitating the voice of Samuel. Then Saul fell straightway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, because of the words of the ventriloquist woman, who had imitated the voice of Samuel. And there was no strength in him, for he had eaten no bread all the day, nor all the night.

Which is the *true* account? The Scriptural or the modern? The reader is left to decide for himself. The writer prefers the Scriptural. For he believes, that, "*literalism* is the God honouring acceptance of His word," and prefers receiving "*the unaltered words of Scripture*," before any interpretation which modern science may be pleased to put upon them.

It is true that the Lord did not answer Saul previous to this, either "by Urim, or by dreams, or by prophets." But there is not one sentence to prove that the Lord did not intend to answer at a future time. And, we