

THE
SANCTUARY - KEEPER:

*A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE
FOR THE EXPOSITION AND DEFENCE
OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.*

EDITED BY

J. J. ANDREW.

| <u>Number 29</u> | <u>March 1902</u> | <u>Volume 8</u> |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|
| Baptismal Belief | | 1 |
| Daniel's 70 Weeks | | 6 |
| Editorial Flyleaf | | 11 |
| Things New & Old No. 23 | | 15 |
| Wandering Out of the Way of Understanding | | 18 |
| The Zionist Movement | | 20 |
| Our Letter Box | | 21 |
| Within the Holy Place | | 22 |

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR,

26, DOUGLAS ROAD, CANONBURY, LONDON, N.

PRICE—GREAT BRITAIN, UNITED STATES, AND THE COLONIES, 6D. PER COPY,
OR 2S. (OR HALF A DOLLAR) PER ANNUM, POST FREE

The Sanctuary-Keeper:

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE FOR THE EXPOSITION AND
DEFENCE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

"Ye (Aaron and his sons) shall keep the charge of the sanctuary, and the charge of the altar."—(Num. xviii. 5.)

"Ye (brethren of Christ) are . . . an holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices."
(I. Pet. ii. 5.)

"Thou hast kept My Word and hast not denied My Name."—(Rev. iii. 8.)

No. 29.

MARCH, 1902.

Vol. VIII.

Baptismal Belief.

JESUS CHRIST.

Many of the references by the Apostles, when preaching to Jews, assume that their hearers knew who and what Jesus was, but a few passages go beyond this, by giving some kind of a definition or description. Thus, on the Day of Pentecost, Peter says: "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by Him" (Acts ii. 22), and in the same discourse the Apostle speaks of Him as the "fruit of David's loins according to the flesh" (verse 30.)

In preaching to Cornelius and his household, Peter reminds them that "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power, who went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for God was with Him" (Acts x. 38.)

If these statements be taken in their simple form, they are sufficient to show what was the nature and position of Jesus Christ at His first appearing, but, when viewed through the ample testimony in the Old Testament Scriptures—on which they are based—they leave no doubt whatever upon this point.

The use of the word "man" is equivalent to saying that Jesus was a descendant of Adam, and the expression "fruit of David's loins" proves that He descended through the Royal line of the Israelitish nation. He necessarily, therefore, entered the world with the disabilities pertaining to man in his fallen state. These consisted of condemnation to death for the first sin that was committed, together with a nature defiled by sin, or, in other words, embracing evil

desire. That this is the logical conclusion of the statements already quoted, and of others in different parts of the scriptures of an analogous character, is shown by the attempt which has been made by the Apostasy to exclude Jesus Christ, by reason of His paternity, from the consequences inherited through the fall of our first parents by all the rest of the race. A few passages, here and there, are supposed to give support to the theory of Christ's exceptional position; but, when rightly understood, they are seen to preclude any such interpretation, and the conclusions based upon them are easily shown to do violence to inspired statements of such an explicit character that no candid, reasonable mind can endorse them.

Thus, a "man of God," through whom God wrought miracles, and whom "God anointed with power," cannot possibly be the second person of the Trinity taught by Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. To have been "approved of God," he must have been in a position in which two courses were possible to Him—one right and the other wrong. To deny this, either directly or by a theory which excludes it, deprives God's approval of all value; therefore, Jesus Christ must have been subject to temptation, and such temptation must have been a reality, not a fiction. From the Trinitarian point of view this was impossible; for although, to avoid a direct denial of Scriptural testimony, Trinitarians admit, in words, the temptation in the wilderness, they make null and void the reality of such temptation, by teaching that the real Jesus Christ was the second person of the Trinity, who literally came down from heaven and was clothed with a body of flesh.

The statements that God anointed Jesus with power, and worked miracles through him, overthrow the Trinitarian claim that He was in all respects "co-equal" with the Father; and when it is remembered that Christ, in His preaching to the Jews, disclaimed the possession of the independent power now attributed to Him, it is obvious that the exaggerated and absolutely false claims put forth in current theology respecting Him had no place whatever in Apostolic preaching.

THE SON OF GOD.

The importance of recognising Jesus Christ to be the Son of God is shown by two declarations in the Acts of the Apostles. The first states that "Saul, after his conversion, straightway preached Christ in the synagogues that He is the Son of God." (Acts ix. 20). The second is in an address in the synagogue at Antioch where, in reminding the Jews of the promise made unto the fathers, Paul says, "God hath fulfilled the same unto us, their children, in that He hath raised up Jesus again: as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." (Acts xiii. 33.)

In view of Christ's claim in His contest with the Jews, to have been the Son of God, this aspect of His Mission must be viewed as essential to acceptance of the Truth concerning Him. When summarising the object of His Mission Jesus says that "God so loved the world that He gave *His only begotten Son*;" and He repeatedly tells the Jews that God is His Father. Hence the contention of some that both His father and mother were human, and that He was not begotten through the power of the Holy Spirit, must be rejected as nullifying a cardinal item of elementary Bible Truth.

Furthermore, the Sonship of Christ shows that He occupied a subordinate position to God; for a son must, in some sense, derive existence from his father, and cannot as a consequence be of the same age as his father; neither can he be co-equal in authority unless such authority be granted to him. To accept Jesus Christ, therefore, as Son of God, logically destroys the doctrine of the Trinity.

Jesus Christ's position as Son of God presents two stages; 1st, as the babe of the Virgin Mary, begotten through the Holy Spirit; and 2nd as the Head

of a New Creation through resurrection from the dead. It is to the latter the Apostle Paul refers in his address at Antioch ; for in declaring that the promise to the fathers had been fulfilled by raising up Jesus from the dead, he quotes from Psalm ii. 7 :—"Thou art my son ; this day have I begotten thee." When born of the Virgin, Christ's sin-bearing mission was in the future ; but when he became "The first begotten of the dead." (Rev. i. 5), he had overcome, and put away, sin in relation to His own defiled nature. Important as was the first stage of His Sonship, much more important was the second. It is the second stage which, on the basis of His obedience unto death gives Him a place in the three-fold name—the Father, Son and Holy Spirit—into which believers are baptised.

THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

We have already seen that the resurrection of Christ occupied a prominent position in Apostolic preaching. This suggests that His death did also. On the day of Pentecost, Peter did not merely charge the Jews with having, "by wicked hands, crucified and slain" Jesus of Nazareth, but declared that this was by the "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" (Acts ii. 23). This is in harmony with the prediction in Gen iii. 15, that the seed of the serpent should "bruise" the seed of the woman in the heel ; with the sacrifices offered up for sin in antediluvian, patriarchal, and Mosaic ages ; and with the few, but very specific, predictions in the Psalms and the writings of the Prophets (Psalm xxii. Isaiah liii., Daniel ix.)

Peter, in his reference to the brief period during which Jesus Christ was dead, uses an expression which clearly shows the reality of that death. He says that God "loosed" the pains of death, because "it was not possible that He should be holden of it" (Acts ii. 24), and that, quoting from the sixteenth Psalm, "His soul was not left in hades." Clearly, then, Jesus Christ was, for a time, holden by the power of death, and this could not have been, from a just point of view, unless he had been a member of the race which was condemned to death because of sin.

The death of Christ destroys entirely the Trinitarian theory, for a Trinitarian, to be consistent, must believe that the inferior part of what he describes as Jesus Christ was that only which was subject to death, the principal part—the alleged second person of the Trinity which came down from Heaven—being incapable of dying. A man must, therefore, obviously be exorcised of the Trinitarian doctrine before he can apostolically believe in the *death* of Jesus Christ.

FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

The personal sins of Jews and Gentiles to whom the Apostles preached are not exactly in the same category. The Jews were under law to God. They had aggravated their frequent violation of that law by rejecting God's Son, and some who felt the force of what Peter said on the Day of Pentecost, "were pricked in their heart," and, as a result, said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" The Apostolic reply to this question was, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts ii. 37-38). In these cases there was clearly moral guilt, and it was, therefore, very fitting that they should be pricked in heart for the wickedness of which they had been guilty—of deeds of darkness committed, with the light in their hands, which should have restrained them.

With the Gentiles the case was different. They had no enlightenment on Divine things, and no opportunity of obtaining light until the Apostles approached them with that light. Hence their wicked course of life was due to knowing no better. It consisted of "fulfilling the desires of the flesh and the mind" (Eph. ii. 3), and their actions are rightly described as "wicked works"

(Col. i. 21). These actions are called "sins," because they are the offspring of sinful flesh, and are committed under "the law of sin and death." Gentiles out of covenant with God, being "in the flesh, cannot please God" (Rom. viii. 8) in relation to a future life. Consequently the statement that Gentiles who had turned from darkness to light "received forgiveness of sins" (Acts xxvi. 18), requires to be viewed somewhat differently from the same phrase as applied to Jews under a Divine law.

We point out this distinction because the term "sins" in regard to Gentiles outside Christ is often misapprehended.

JUSTIFICATION.

In addressing the Jews at Antioch the Apostle Paul said: "Be it known unto you, therefore, brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses" (Acts xiii. 38-9).

The expression "forgiveness of sins" is rightly viewed here as having reference to the personal transgressions of the Jews; but the Apostle does not stop there. He says that they may also, through Christ, be "justified from all things from which" the sacrifices under the Mosaic Law could not justify them. This is an important announcement, and one which has not received, as a rule, the attention which it deserves. To be rightly understood, it is necessary to note the things from which Jews, under the Mosaic Law, required cleansing. Some of them might have resulted from mere accidents, such as the touching of a dead body, or coming in contact with matter from a suppurating wound. But they all had their origin in the defiled condition of fallen human nature. Two of the most important ceremonies of this nature were: (1) circumcision and (2) the cleansing of a mother after the birth of a child. Circumcision, and the sacrifices offered for such cleansing, typified the sacrifice of Christ. The Jews, therefore, were reminded by the birth of every man-child that their nature was defiled with sin, and that the new-born babe and its mother could not approach God in the way He had appointed, without a cleansing ceremony involving blood-shedding. A subject which was so frequently and prominently brought before the Jewish people for a period of 1,000 years cannot be a matter to be lightly passed over, when considering the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice, and an understanding of baptism.

The Jews to whom the Apostle spoke would understand, and rightly so, that their violations of the Mosaic law, arising out of their defiled nature—from which the Mosaic ceremonies could only temporarily cleanse them—would be the subject of complete justification by virtue of the sacrifice of Jesus of Nazareth.

It cannot be supposed that the promised justification was applicable to Jews only. The Jews at Antioch rejected with disdain Paul's offer of *forgiveness* and *justification*; but, immediately Paul and Barnabas turned to the Gentiles and communicated the same offer to them—saying, "It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you, but seeing ye put it from you and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles" (Acts xiii, 46); "and when the Gentiles heard this they were glad and glorified the Word of the Lord" (ver. 48).

The logical conclusion of this statement is that the Gentiles were told that, through Christ, they could obtain forgiveness of their individual sins and justification from their sinful nature; for the ceremonies under the Mosaic law arising out of the sinful nature of the Jews were imposed upon them—not because they were different in constitution from the rest of mankind—but because they were favoured by Jehovah with the means of approach unto Him; and this "open way" necessitated a covering, or atonement, for sin in both its aspects, viz., in nature and in action.

It is reasonable to conclude that if baptism into Christ's death has relation to both these aspects of sin, some of the references to the ceremony in the Apostolic writings will afford evidence thereof. We have already seen that, to understand the things pertaining to the Kingdom, briefly mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, a believer prior to baptism must consult the writings of the Prophets; and, therefore, on the same principle, to obtain a full understanding of the "Things of the Name," so briefly mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, such an one must refer to their epistles.

Writing to the Corinthian ecclesia, which was probably composed largely of Gentiles, the Apostle says, after referring to their previous evil course of life, "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. vi. 11.) This was clearly a reference to what took place when they were baptised into Christ's name. The washing and the justification can only have reference to sin, and if there had been sin in regard only to conduct, there would have been no necessity for two distinct words. The word "sanctified," of course, has reference to the separated or holy condition, resulting from introduction into the name of salvation.

The ecclesia at Colosse, like that at Corinth, probably contained a considerable proportion of Gentiles. In chap. ii., verse 11., the Apostle describes Christ's death as a circumcision, and states that the Colossians had partaken of that circumcision, with the result that they had "put off the body of the sins of the flesh" by being "buried with him in baptism" (verse 12). In verse 13 this point is amplified in the following words:—"And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him having forgiven you all trespasses." Two things are stated here as having caused the previous "dead" condition of the Colossians. These are (1) "your sins," and (2) "the uncircumcision of your flesh." The "sins" clearly describe their actions, their uncircumcised flesh, their sin-nature. Here, then, are the two aspects of sin already noticed. The statement that these two forms of sin had caused a "dead" condition is followed by the declaration that the Colossian brethren had been "quickened together with him." The quickening, or, in other words, life-giving condition, clearly covered that which caused the dead condition. If the quickening had not embraced both aspects of sin, it would have been defective, and it is worthy of note that the Apostle does not set forth these things to the Colossians as if they were new, but he writes of them as matters with which they were already acquainted.

In the following chapters the Apostle makes reference to the same aspect of baptism when he says:—"Ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man" (Col. iii. 9-10). The "old man," synonymous with uncircumcised flesh, is put off, not in a physical, but in a constitutional sense, and the putting off of his deeds is analagous to the forgiveness of sinful actions. In like manner, the putting on of the "new man" is not in a physical, but in a constitutional, sense.

In writing to Jewish brethren of Christ, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says to them:—"Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water" (Heb. x. 22). Here, again, is a two-fold aspect of baptism in relation to sin. The "evil conscience" clearly has reference to the wicked conduct of the Jews, the forgiveness of which is figuratively described as having their "hearts sprinkled." Bodies which needed to be "washed" were obviously in some sense unclean. Baptism, being a religious ceremony, was not intended for ablutionary purposes, and, therefore, the cleansing was not literal. The washing of the bodies can only be understood in a spiritual sense, and a washing based upon blood shedding must be related to sin. The statement of the Apostle, if paraphrased, would read, "Our consciences cleansed from evil actions, and our bodies of sin ceremonially washed, and thus constituted holy" (1 Cor. iii. 17).

We have one case where baptism was administered solely in respect to inherited sin, and that is the case of Jesus Christ. When He came to be baptised, John the Baptist, knowing His blameless life as a Jew under the Law, viewed such a ceremony as superfluous, and, accordingly, "forbad him." To this Jesus responded: "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 14-15).

The expression, "fulfil all righteousness" implies that Christ's righteousness would not have been complete without passing through a baptismal ceremony by which he was provisionally justified from his sin-nature, preparatory to a permanent justification, or cutting off, by his death. That which was so necessary for the Head must surely be necessary likewise for those who wish to be members of His body. This is implied by the word "us." Hence they must recognise, as the Head recognised, their sin-nature and the cleansing efficacy, in a ceremonial sense, of baptism into his death. The very expression, "baptised into His death" (Rom. vi. 3), involves this. For why did Christ have to die? That God, in Him, might condemn "sin in the flesh" (Rom. viii. 3.)

It is considered necessary that the personal sins of believers should be recognised before going through the waters of immersion, and anyone denying that there were such personal sins would rightly be refused baptism. Does not the evidence justify a similar position in respect to the sin-nature? If it be necessary that the believer should realise that he obtains forgiveness of his individual sins by baptism into Christ, is it not equally necessary that he should recognise the same ceremony to be a means of justification from his sin-nature?

EDITOR.

(To be continued.)

[The first instalment of this article appeared in our last number—28.]

Daniel's 70 Weeks and their Connexion with the 2,300 Days, and Jewish Restoration.

THE PASSAGES QUOTED ARE FROM THE ENGLISH REVISED EDITION.

Unlike Daniel's former visions, this of the 8th ch., and the prediction of the seventy weeks in the 9th, take no account of Gentile times, but are intimately concerned with the Sanctuary and the Messiah.

The vision of the contending ram and goat predicted Persian and Greek warfare, resulting in Greek supremacy: to be followed by a power, fierce in aspect, and artful in ruling ability, who would, when Jewish iniquity reached its height, destroy wonderfully the holy people, stamp the truth to the ground, and afterwards be the subject of destruction.

We can readily see in this a description of Rome pagan and papal; but Daniel could not at that time. Its dreadful prospect made him ill; he was "astonished at the vision, but none understood it" (viii., 27.)

Its duration was made known to him, however, and we must note closely the question that made it public. "How long shall be the vision of the continual burnt offering and the transgression that maketh desolate, *to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden underfoot?*" This was answered by "Unto two thousand three hundred evening-mornings; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (verse 14.)

By this Daniel knew that their impending restoration would be followed by greater desolation than before; but, until the sanctuary and the nation had been restored, and *again* been the subjects of defilement and overthrow, none could determine the ending of these calamities, because the beginning of them had yet to be seen.

When Darius the Mede became king in the place of Belshazzar, Daniel knew the hour of release was at hand, having "understood by books the number of the years for the accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem" (ix., 1.)

He prayed according to his heart's desire and was rewarded by a visit from the angel Gabriel, who came to "make him skilful of understanding," and to "understand the vision" (ix., 23.) What vision? Surely the one that "none understood" contained in the 8th chapter. He was informed—"Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city to finish transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most holy" (verse 24.)

The Jews finished their transgression in crucifying Messiah, who put away sins, and brought about reconciliation and enduring righteousness, confirmed previous covenants, and, as a consequence, was antitypically anointed, by immortalisation.

This was to be accomplished in 70 prophetic weeks, which is 490 years.

The Angel next proceeds to indicate the commencement of these years:—"Know, therefore, and discern that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Anointed One, the prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks; it shall be built again with street and moat, even in troublous times" (verse 25).

The question that arises here is, Why is this period of 69 weeks divided into two parts? No reason is given.

Next we read in ver. 26, "After the threescore and two weeks shall the anointed one be cut off, and shall have nothing," and that this iniquitous proceeding would be followed by retribution, the city and sanctuary being destroyed, and the end come upon the Jewish nation as a flood. Before this "he shall make a firm covenant with many" during "one week." This evidently is the seven years during which, by the preaching of John and Jesus, many made a covenant with God, by means of the perfect sacrifice which caused Mosaic "sacrifice and oblation to cease."

We can see why the last important week of seven years is considered separately, but again we ask, Why is the seven weeks (forty-nine years) separated from the sixty-two?

Before suggesting the reason, let us consider when these predictions began to come about. Like most long periods of prophetic time, there are events leading up to the beginning, necessary for its development, which may be mistaken for its actual starting point. Four royal decrees mark as many stages in the restoration that took place under Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah. Their overthrow had been gradual; their recovery from it was the same. Nebuchadnezzar took Jehoiakim and the city in 605 B.C., and seventeen years later destroyed it utterly. In the first year of the Persian monarchy, "that the word of the Lord by Jeremiah might be accomplished," Cyrus was

stirred up to proclaim liberty to the captives and permission to restore the Temple ; and about seventeen years later (519 B.C.) Darius the Persian caused this work to be finished by another decree, necessitated by Samaritan opposition and Jewish faintheartedness, which "had caused the work to cease."

Renewed hostility against the Jews "threatened wrath against the realm" of a subsequent monarch, Artaxerxes, and he made a decree in the seventh year of his reign, confirming previous decrees, giving liberal donations from the treasury for the work of the restoration, and, in addition, granting leave to Ezra to organise magistrates and judges in Judah ; a measure of self-government once more. This was in 456 B.C.

The fourth decree commissioned Nehemiah in 444-5 B.C. to "build the wall" of Jerusalem, and to govern the city ; which difficult task he successfully carried out, in the face of malevolent opposition from within and from without. He placed Jerusalem in the security of walls and gates the same year.

During his administration as Tirshatha, the people were reformed, and the polluted priesthood and Sanctuary cleansed from the presence of the semi-idolatrourous relatives of the high priest. These events are a faint type of the cleansing of the Sanctuary by the anti-typical Ezra (Help), and the anti-typical Nehemiah (God comforts) ; by that coming governor-priest under whom Israel will soon obtain more than "grace for a little moment, a nail in His holy place, and a little reviving" (Ezra ix., 8).

Of the four decrees having to do with the restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem, we have seen that the former two are notable as endings of two stages of seventy years' desolation. The other two mark two beginnings of the 490 years unto the Messiah, and, consequently, there are two endings.

From the third decree of 456 B.C. to the crucifixion or cutting off, 490 years elapsed, and their expiry was foreknown to Jesus to the very day.

From 444-5 B.C., when the final decree was issued, to the thirtieth year of Jesus, is 490 lunar years. He was then symbolically "cut off" in baptism, and at the same time became literally the "anointed one" by the Holy Spirit descending upon him (Acts x., 38). This was "His manifestation to Israel" when he began to preach, saying "*The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand ; repent ye, and believe the Gospel*" (Mark i., 15). This, of course, is preliminary to the final ending at the crucifixion.

Jewish ecclesiastical affairs were regulated by lunar time ; the moon, as well as the sun, having been given for times and seasons (Gen. i., 14). As in former years, "from one new moon to another" (Is. lxvi.) will mark off periods for worship, when the Sanctuary is restored ; it is likely, therefore, that dates relating to these things are given both on lunar and solar scales. A lunar year is 10 days and 11 hours less than a solar.

Reverting now to the condition of the Jews under Nehemiah : we learn from sacred and human history that they enjoyed relief from oppression whilst under the just, but stern, governorship of Nehemiah, who ruled without taking the payment that some of his predecessors had exacted, because of his devotion to the cause and people of God.

Their comparative obedience secured them from the domination of a Persian governor, with a Sanctuary undefiled by Gentiles for about forty-nine years.

The close of this period of forty-nine years was signalized by a final message from Jehovah. The state of the Israelites is vividly set forth and denounced by Malachi. The priests had disgraced and corrupted themselves, polluted the worship in the Temple, and caused the people to stumble at the law ; God "had no pleasure in them, neither would He accept an offering at their hand." The warning was uttered, "If ye will not hear, I will send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings ; yea, I have cursed them already ; behold I will corrupt your seed and spread dung upon your faces, even the dung of your

solemn feasts, and ye shall be taken away with it." Prophecy ceased at this point of time; a "famine of hearing the words of the Lord" supervened, and the Holy Spirit no more spoke through man to Israel till towards the close of the seventy weeks, when John the Baptist came "in the spirit and power of Elijah, to revive the hearts of the fathers in the children," that they might be ready to accept the Messiah, and escape being smitten with the curse that was prophesied for his rejectors.

Whether Malachi's words had any effect in warding off the threatened retribution, history is not definite enough to show. The first event of note that it records, in connection with the renewal of oppression, is given by Josephus: it took place thirty years after the expiry of the forty-nine years.

He informs us that the high priest John, grandson of Eliashib (Neh. xiii., 28) quarrelled in the temple with his brother—the son-in-law of the Sanballat mentioned by Nehemiah—and slew him there. The Jews were at this time again under a Persian governor, Bagoses, who oppressively taxed every sacrifice offered, and who, after the murder, insisted upon entering the temple, saying that his presence could not pollute it more than the high priest had done. "The people were on account of this murder, enslaved, and the temple was polluted by the Persians" (Josephus, Book 11, ch. 7).

In such circumstances we may find the explanation of the dividing off of the seven weeks from the 69. Seven prophetic weeks, or 49 literal years, seems to be the length of time of their "little reviving," under an autonomous government; at their expiry, I think the 2,300 years commences.

Deducting, therefore, this period from 444—in which year the command to rebuild the walls was given—we find that 395 B.C. commences the time of Sanctuary pollution and Jewish downtreading. From that time Greek, Syrian and Egyptian alternately made Palestine their battleground—enslaving, plundering, and killing the Jews in multitudes. At intervals they obtained some ease, as under the Maccabees. The Romans ultimately, when Jewish iniquity was consummated in the crucifying of Messiah, carried them away as by a flood, and completed the treading under foot that commenced after the Restoration.

Daniel briefly adds (ix., 27) that wrath will be poured upon the Jewish desolator, thus finishing with the last thing mentioned in the previous vision of ch. 8, where we read that he shall be broken "without hand"; the manner of the breaking being described elsewhere by him.

Like the representative Holy one (viii., 13), we anxiously enquire, "How long shall be the vision?"; for Jewish uprising indicates that the time of our redemption draws nigh.

The question relates to the giving of "the Sanctuary and host to be trodden under foot," which appears to have been, as before stated, in or about 395 B.C. Measuring from this time, the 2,300 YEARS WILL EXPIRE IN 1905.

Zionism is now a political factor that is to be reckoned with; it is countenanced by the German Emperor, and the Sultan seems willing, for a price, to open his Palestinian dominions to the Jew. But they have not succeeded in their commercial and other attempts to obtain enough money. Israel sold themselves for nought, and they are to be "redeemed without money." It may be that success will be gained by political means. Chronic unrest is the state of the Turk, and suspicion of the designs of each other, the state of his Russian, Austrian, and Italian neighbours. Much may happen in four years, and we may surely look for some event as definite as the royal decrees for their former restoration, to take place about the expiry of that time.

It will be seen that the above calculations are based upon the 2,300 days named in the Authorised Version. If these be correct there is obviously no need to adopt the figures found in any exceptional manuscript of Daniel.

A word as to former expositions of this Sanctuary cycle. It has been

thought to commence with the first event seen in the vision, namely, the uprising of the Persian above the Median power, which took place in 536 B.C. This, as a preliminary commencement of the cycle, brings us to 1764, which was a period when Jewish conditions began to improve. An Emancipation Act had been passed in England, and was followed afterwards by the American revolted colonies embodying the principle of Jewish equality in their new constitution. The French Revolution quickly followed, which shook into ruin the Continental States, and, at the same time, unloosed the fetters from the then everywhere despised and persecuted Israelite, who thereupon quickly asserted himself.

Again, it has been suggested that the first notable event in the vision, viz., the Persian ram pushing the Grecian goat, is the starting point. This was in 480 B.C., when Xerxes invaded Greece. Two thousand three hundred years from thence falls in 1820, at which time the first decisive blow at the power which still defiles and possesses the Sanctuary-land was struck. Greece revolted, and became separated from Turkey, whose fleet was also destroyed.

Again, two thousand three hundred measured from the restoration decrees of 456 and 444 B.C., run out in 1844 and 1856. In the former year Turkey—the Power raised up to chastize the Catholic apostacy in the East (Rev. ch. ix.)—was “required” to cease the execution of apostates, and an edict was extorted, granting religious toleration in its dominions; in the latter, the Crimean war came to an end, and, by the Treaty of Paris which followed it, the Powers undertook to regulate the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire.

Each of these events is a distinct step towards the “cleansing” of the Sanctuary-land, and it is in harmony with the Divine system of prophetic times to regard them as initiatory fulfilments of the cycle. As they develop we gain confidence in looking for the speedy and complete fulfilment from its latest and final starting point.

Caution is to be advised in dealing with dates, which we have to reason out, and modesty in our deductions therefrom. Presumptuous statements as the following ought to be guarded against. Speaking of Sanctuary cleansing, a Mr. Dumbleby declares:—“Jerusalem cannot be trodden down a moment later than 1898 $\frac{1}{2}$, unless we can quench the sun and stop the rotation of the earth.”

Yet difficulties, failures, and the follies of men should not deter from the study of an element of revelation which was given that in due time it might be understood. “Pray for the peace of Jerusalem;” “God shall arise and have mercy upon Zion, for it is time to have pity upon her, yea, the *set time* is come.”

R. H. FORD.

[We insert the foregoing thoughtful contribution as a help toward the solution of an important prophetic time, the interpretations of which have not hitherto been satisfactory. We shall be prepared to consider the insertion in future numbers of further remarks or criticisms which any of our readers may have to offer.—ED. S.K.]

Editorial Flyleaf.

We tender our thanks to those subscribers who have remitted for Volume Eight, and, in answer to several inquiries relating to health, we beg to say that it continued fairly good until the middle of January, when, in consequence of unexpected and very exceptional worry, connected with business, the Editor had a recurrence of some of the symptoms which he had two and a half years ago, and from which, at the time of writing, he had not recovered. What the future may bring he knows not. He commits himself to an all-wise and merciful Father.

One of the most stupendous and useful engineering works of modern times is the dam thrown across the Nile, by which 2,500 square miles of land are added to the crop-bearing area of Egypt. The difficulties of the undertaking have been immense. Operations have sometimes had to be suspended for months together when the Nile was at his highest, and it has been necessary to dig to enormous depths to find sure foundations. The work is being carried out by British capitalists and engineers, and Egypt provides nothing towards the cost until the work is completed. The payments will then be spread over 30 years, and these, it is presumable, will be a comparatively easy task, because the additional area of the soil will considerably enhance the national revenue.

The undertaking is interesting as bearing upon the future of Egypt. Anything which makes that country more productive will increase the cupidity of Russia, stimulated by France, to wrest it from British control. Little do the

men of wealth and skill know they are doing a work which will help to deprive Britain of her present supremacy in that part of Africa.

The article in the present number on "Daniel's Seventy Weeks," by Bro. R. H. Ford, contains some precautionary remarks in regard to deductions from dates connected with prophetic times, which are very opportune, in view of the disappointment caused in 1900, and also in 1896, through the presumptuous dogmatism of recent prophetic expositions.

We were recently reminded of another instance, by the re-perusal of a letter, dated December 4th, 1874, written to us by a very earnest brother, who said:—

"I have just been reading an extraordinary work of Thurman's, of America, and you should ponder its contents! He demonstrates from Scripture, history, and astronomy, in combination, the commencement and ending of the Scripture lines of time, and makes the ultimate in all cases to converge to the 14th of the first (Jewish) month, 1875, or, say, 19th April, 1875, and I defy you, or anyone else, to find a flaw in his reasoning out this result, and what is of *great moment*, in doing so he verifies the accuracy of the text of the Scriptures."

The flaw which this brother thought it impossible to detect has been exposed by the effluxion of time. Nevertheless, such efforts are not to be despised. Although failures, they often contribute something towards a correct solution, if only in showing to subsequent investigators some of the pitfalls to avoid. The difficulties in solving prophetic-time problems will, doubtless, be gradually removed as we come nearer to the time for their expiration. Hence the wisdom

of further investigation, undaunted by past mistakes.

In the *Christadelphian* for November the following passage occurs:—

"What did Paul mean when he said to the Colossians that they had put off the old man with his deeds?" Answer: The meaning is sufficiently obvious from the context. Read verses 8 to 10, "But now ye also put off all these, anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.

"The old man" is descriptive of the evil character of the natural man. "The new man" defines the character of such an one transformed by the knowledge and obedience of Christ. A Colossian who had been a thief and a liar, and had been transformed by the Gospel into an honest, truthful, affectionate servant of Christ, would have put off the old man with his deeds. The matter is as plain as possible to senses unspoiled by theological metaphysics.

The meaning of Paul's statement in Colossians is certainly sufficiently obvious from the context, but the Editor of the *Christadelphian* does not give that meaning. It is true that there is a putting off of the old man with his deeds during probation in the sense of walking in Christ's footsteps, but it is also true that the old man with his deeds, in another sense, is put off at baptism, and this is what the Apostle refers to when he says, "Ye have put off the old man with his deeds."

This fact is used by him as a reason for not practising some of the deeds of the old man, viz., lying one to another. If the old man with his deeds had been put off completely in the character-aspect, there would have been no need to give the exhortation, "Lie not one to another."

It was because they had put off the old man with his deeds—in a constitutional sense, by immersion into the New Man Christ—that the Apostle appeals to them to act in harmony with this changed

position. To represent the putting off of the old man with his deeds as wholly a question of character is misleading, and the reverse of a right division of the Word of Truth. It is twofold—1st, constitutional; 2nd, in character; and the first is the basis, or reason, for the second.

In the same number of the *Christadelphian* the following question occurs in "Answers to Correspondents":—

"Could Christ have been raised from the dead, apart from the shedding of his blood?" In reply, the Editor says:—

"It is unprofitable for mortals to speculate as to what might, or could, have been had things been different. God only requires us to rightly exercise our minds on His will and purpose concerning things as they are and shall be. The Scriptures tell us concerning the resurrection of Christ, that it was because he was 'an holy one' that God raised him from the dead. His holiness and righteousness was manifested in perfection in his obedience unto his death. This is the positive teaching of Scripture. We do not care to contemplate or discuss contradictory or hypothetical conditions."

In the statements which we have put in italics in the above quotation, the Editor of the *Christadelphian* virtually allows the point of the question, for he practically asserts that the shedding of His blood was part of Christ's perfect obedience on the basis of which He was raised from the dead. There need not therefore, have been any apparent diffidence in giving a straight answer to the question. Indeed, the author of the *Twelve Lectures* took very strong ground in relation to the necessity of Christ's perfect obedience, including therein the shedding of His blood as a basis for resurrection, for in that work, pp. 146-7, he wrote:—

"The necessities of the case have been perfectly met by Jesus Christ. The first necessity was that the law, both Edenic and Mosaic, should be enforced. The law required the death of the transgressing nature, viz., human nature. . . . But it was also necessary that he should be holy, because, if he had been a sinner

himself, his sacrifice would have been of no avail, inasmuch as his own sin would have prevented his resurrection, necessitating the perpetual dominion of death over him. . . . If Christ had been a personal transgressor, God could not have raised him from the dead, because the law of sin would have kept him in the grave, and the scheme of salvation would have miscarried at its most vital juncture." (Italics ours).

This quotation is in harmony with Scripture teaching in relation to the operation of the law of sin and death, and it is what we have contended for all through the recent division. Was it because the full force of the argument, involved in the question put to the Editor of the *Christadelphian*, was seen to completely nullify the enlightened rejector theory that he does not care to contemplate or discuss hypothetical conditions?

The Editor of the *Christadelphian*, in the January number, in a note to someone on the "Responsibility Question," quotes the following as evidence of resurrection to judgment of the unbaptised rejector of the Truth. "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin." (Jas. iv. 17).

This is an illustration of misapplication of Scripture through ignoring the context. The verse begins with the word "Therefore," which clearly implies that it is connected with that which goes before. The preceding verses deal wholly with those in Christ, verses 13, 14, and 15, admonishing them that their business affairs should be subject to God's will, because their life was a vapour ready to vanish away. This apparently the brethren in question did not do; for, after the admonition in verse 13 to 15, the Apostle says: "But now ye rejoice in your boastings, all such rejoicing is evil."

Then follows verse 17: "Therefore to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin." Obviously the word "him" in this verse is equivalent to "ye," and, in effect, states that if the

boastings be continued, after being shown what God required, they would be sin. To apply the words to any out of Christ is to perpetrate what logicians call a *non sequitur*. It is virtually to represent the Apostle as saying that because those in Christ did evil when they knew what was good, those out of Christ doing the same were equally guilty of sin against Divine law. This quite ignores the apostolic dictum elsewhere, that they "that are in the flesh cannot please God," and that, consequently, all they do is sin in relation to God's will. As well might we say that the statement in verse 6 applies to those out of Christ equally with those in Christ, "God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble."

In the Diary describing Bro. Sulley's visit to America, Australia, and New Zealand, there occurs the following incident, which we cordially commend to the notice of any others situated in a similar position.

"Many years ago the writer was visiting a brother and sister almost in isolation. After breaking bread, there seemed to be an absence of one necessary element—a collection. Upon suggesting the advisability of making one, it was explained: 'We are generally alone, and we have no special call for anything of that kind. When there is, we do our best.' Upon which I remarked somewhat as follows: 'We are commanded by the Apostle to make a collection on the first day of the week as an offering to God.' 'Let every man lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him' (1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2). You, as the husband, earn so much. 'Honour the Lord with thy substance.' If you put on one side every first day a proportionate sum, as indicated in the types under the law, you will have the money to spend when the opportunity comes. Likewise your wife—she receives so much for keeping house—perchance she can 'save' out yet a little. Now, if both lay by in this way, it will be ready when required.

"If you have no case of need amongst your small assembly, there are plenty in large ecclesias and in isolation who need help. Then, again, after your 'store'

increases to a sufficient sum, you might make a public proclamation of the truth in your neighbourhood, for you will have sufficient 'laid by' for travelling expenses and advertising, &c.; and the Lord may prosper your ways and increase your numbers. The suggestion 'caught on,' as we say. And now there are more than 'two or three' meeting in that place; and, moreover, many have come to a knowledge of the truth as a consequence of the public proclamation in this little place."—*The Christadelphian*, January, 1902, p. 34.

The *Christadelphian Advocate* for last November contains a letter on the Inspiration question, signed "John Genders," of Birmingham, dealing with an editorial criticism of a statement in the July *Fraternal Visitor*, that the original MSS. of the Bible are "at the present time non-existent," and "the most one can say concerning them is but affirmation without evidence." This letter is followed by a reply by Bro. Thos. Williams, editor of the *Advocate*.

The February number of the *Christadelphian Advocate* contains a second letter from the above-named writer, followed likewise by an editorial reply. To those who are interested in the question of Inspiration, these communications are well worth perusal, inasmuch as they deal with the root of the matter.

In the second letter from Bro. Genders, he says that the statement about the original MSS. was "a slip of the pen," and that it related, not to the writings themselves, but to the "parchment and ink." The *Fraternal Visitor* for February contains an editorial criticism of Bro. Williams' article in the November *Christadelphian Advocate*, in which Bro. J. J. Hadley says that the statement in question "in its absolute nakedness cannot be defended," and further adds that "it ought to have been qualified" by a remark that it referred to the question as to whether the original MSS. "were absolutely free from error."

In the *Fraternal Visitor* criticism it is contended that if the word "inspiration" in II. Tim. iii. 16, means the "absolute inerrancy" of the "Holy Scriptures," it would be equally logical to contend, on the basis of the word "inspiration" in Job xxxii. 8, that the "human understanding" was "likewise infallible." But there is a flaw in this reasoning. The two passages are not of equal authority. There is no question about the passage in II. Tim. iii. 16 having been written by Paul under Spirit guidance, but the statement in Job xxxii. 8 was uttered by a man who was not under Spirit guidance, viz., Elihu, who spake some things that were true and some that were false. Inspiration, therefore, is only responsible for a correct record of what Elihu uttered.

The whole gist of the criticism by the Editor of the *Fraternal Visitor* is to the effect that the Bible is wholly inspired, but that Divine inspiration does not involve freedom from error—a kind of inspiration which, it may be remarked, constitutes the Bible the very reverse of an Impregnable Rock.

As an illustration of the kind of error which inspired writings are said to contain, reference is made to a discrepancy in the two records of the same event in Matt. xxi. 40, 41, and Luke xx. 15-16, in which an answer, attributed to Christ by one historian, is, by the other, placed in the mouth of his disciples.

On this point, Dr. Adam Clarke, in commenting on the passage in Matthew, says:—

"But Luke relates it differently. According to him, they said, *God forbid!* The 'Codex Leicestrensis' omits *ο λεγομεν*, they say; so that the following words appear to be spoken by our Lord. Michaelis supposes that in the Hebrew original the word was *uoiomer*, he said; for which the Greek translator might have read, *uoiomeru*, they said."

We do not quote this as an absolute solution of the difficulty, but as an indication of how the discrepancy most probably originated, and to show on what slender grounds the contention for a Divine inspiration admitting of error, is based.

On the eve of going to press, we have received a pamphlet, of about 16 pages, entitled "The sign of the prophet Jonah; a vindication of the Truth: by William F. Richards, of 390, New Cross Road, London, S.E." Its object is to show that Jesus was seventy-two hours in the Tomb, and, thereby, to refute the popular belief that he was only there from Friday afternoon until Sunday morning. We have not had time to critically examine the evidence and the arguments presented by Bro. Richards—who is a member of the South London Ecclesia—but we may say that we have long been convinced that the popular view on this subject is erroneous.

The Treaty of Alliance between Great Britain and Japan, published on the 12th of February, is a very important document. It provides for two contingencies. First, if either Nation has to defend its own interests in the Far East, the other undertakes to remain neutral; and, second, if either of them should go to war in defence of interests common to both, and is attacked by more than one hostile power, it is to receive assistance from the other party to the Alliance.

On the surface, it is defensive and pacific, but, in reality, it is intended to resist the encroachments of Russia in the Far East, which—notwithstanding her disclaimers—are being steadily, but quietly, consolidated.

This step confirms the opinion we have expressed in former numbers of the SANCTUARY KEEPER, that the "tidings out of east and out of the north" (Dan. ii. 44), which are to trouble Russia when invading the Holy Land, are likely to come from the Far East, and from the British Isles.

Things New and Old.—No. 23.

PETER'S FIRST LETTER.—Continued.

The Scriptural Quotations are nearly all given, as in Young's Translation.

It must have been no small satisfaction to the brethren who were to witness the impending judgment upon the House of Israel, to receive the Divine Message, for such is this Epistle. Indeed, all the Apostolic Epistles are Divine messages, and each has its important bearing upon the time and circumstances in which brethren have been, and are, placed. This feature is a clear indication of their Divine source, for none but the Deity could have so framed a message or messages as at once to so completely provide for existing circumstances, and also for unborn ages, as

to afford encouragement, guidance, and comfort to all those who were truly his children. Such, however, is the case, and a close acquaintance with the Word enables us to realise this.

A correct understanding is what the Truth-loving servant of Christ desires; and it is in doctrinal matters more than in precept or exhortation, that great care in interpretation is required, because the latter are much more easily apprehended. They are more closely related to every-day events in our lives than doctrines which necessarily include things pertaining to the Deity him-

self. We should therefore realise that in order to attain accuracy and a definiteness compatible with the clear and perfect will of God, devout study and a steady application of the mind are absolutely necessary.

That such a course will be profitable there can be no doubt; the many references made to other parts of the Scriptures will very often shed a light on a verse or expression which enables the true meaning to be understood, and thereby cause us to rejoice in being able to produce a "Thus saith the Lord."

That the Epistles *all* abound in both exhortation and doctrine is an obvious truth, and it is by both that we are enabled to build ourselves and others up in the most holy Faith in which we are called.

Peter, like Paul, gloried only in the Lord, and both realised their ambassadorial work; both realised that they were chosen to be leaders of the brethren, the one of the Jews, and the other of the Gentiles. What would seem egotism in men less honourably placed, becomes the charm of pleading and beseeching "in Christ's stead," and a spirit of admiration results in all those who love to dwell on their words. How refreshing, therefore, is Peter's entreaty in the first verse of this chapter:—"Elders who are among you, I exhort, who am a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of the Christ, and of the glory about to be revealed a partaker; tend the flock of God which is among you, being overseers, not constrainedly, but willingly, neither for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind, neither as exercising lordship over the heritages, but patterns becoming of the flock; and at the manifestation of the Chief Shepherd, ye shall receive the unfading Crown of Glory" (verses 1-4).

There are not very many words in the above, but there is a fund of wisdom in the seven points:—The Elders were considered as shepherds among the brethren, acting under a "Chief Shepherd," whom in an earlier portion of the Epistle they had been reminded that they loved

(chap. 1, 8). *Now* was their practical manifestation of that love to be seen; 1st, to be constituted an overseer or shepherd was an honour; secondly, the work was to be "not constrainedly," that is, with a feeling of compulsion or irksomeness. It is possible to accomplish work under such conditions, but where would the vitality be? Its equivalent in the world to-day is "the form of godliness without the power." Sheep tended under such conditions are restricted from that sweet pasturage and love of travelling o'er the word which improves them, just as in the natural sheep careful shepherding and *roaming* at will over the sweet pastures fattens and keeps them in health.

Thirdly, "but willingly." This is a grand trait of character in any worker for the Master; it embraces readiness, desire, and inclination, without reluctance. The conditions in those days were the reverse of pleasantness; it frequently meant the loss of all prestige, and not infrequently the loss of life itself. We labour under far more favourable conditions; let us, therefore, use that "willingness" which shall be pleasing to the Chief Shepherd.

Fourthly, "Neither for filthy lucre." Under various excuses and for divers reasons, the world, with its form of godliness but lacking the power, has chosen to ignore this excellent exhortation; but happily those who know and love the Truth have ever, so far as my knowledge goes, resisted an innovation which must always sap the labour of its virtue.

Fifthly, "but of a ready mind": that is, a mind without the promptings of a sordid nature, such as must more or less operate where "filthy lucre" is an operative force. "The hireling fleeth *because* he is an hireling and careth not for the sheep," said the Chief Shepherd.

Sixthly, "Neither as exercising lordship over the heritages." This term "heritages" covers a fund of meaning; it is a term which shows that the sheep were those who had come under heirship

by a course of law. What law? Not the Mosaic, but the law of Truth (Ps. 119, v. 142), which centres in the Righteousness of the Deity, and is manifest in Jesus Christ, through whom all receive the adoption to sonship and joint heirship with Christ. Equality, in the sense of all being "one in Christ Jesus," is their position, and Peter was, in effect, pointing out that. This would *effectually* prevent the lordship which is exercised by "that form of godliness which is without its power." It would further lead to their being

Seventhly, "Patterns becoming of the flock;" in character sustaining the high position which they were privileged to occupy. How befitting that the reward should be next mentioned, and associated with the Chief Shepherd's return, and how grandly, too, does *the power* of godliness manifest itself in the words which the Spirit gave; and how thankful we should be, brethren, when we realise that we have been brought out of darkness into light—from a state of alienation from God, both racial and personal, to be constituted as amongst "the heritages" of God.

Although to the Elders were given the burden of responsibility as teachers and shepherds, the Younger are not in anywise neglected, nor is the measure of responsibility to be lightly esteemed. There was to be a recognition of the Elders' work, and a subjection to it also. Now this would not have been the case if the Eternal Spirit had not been the author and guide. The word which was to stand for them and the subsequent ages came from no other source. Elder and Younger were both to recognise this; hence the authoritative power was always blended with wisdom and love. The subjection had reference to the controlling of the mind, which a right training aims at, the perfect unity between the Elder and the Younger being at the same time enjoined, as shown by the words, "but all to one another subjecting yourselves." Pride would be thus effectually

prevented in both, as indicated by the exhortation, "with humble-mindedness be clothed." If this were acted upon each class would realise that "God the proud resisteth, but to the humble He giveth grace;" and would recognise the force of the injunction, "Be humbled then under the powerful hand of God, that He may exalt you in due time—all your care having cast on Him because He careth for you."

Soberness and vigilance are next the subject of exhortation—two things which are *ever* necessary, but especially in the days when the Epistle was written, "because your opponent, *the devil*, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may swallow up, whom resist, steadfast in the Faith, knowing the same sufferings to your brotherhood in the world to be accomplished."

The "devil," here styled an "opponent" or "adversary," doubtless represents the officials of Paganism who were on the look-out for Christ's brethren, to bring them before the tribunals for practising a religion not recognised by the State.*

There is a similarity and a difference between their state and ours, which a glance at the respective times will make more apparent. Their times were full of *deadly* peril; the Pagan devotees were numerous and active, and to be taken by them was to be "swallowed up" in death unless retraction was made. Resistance, *associated* with "steadfastness in the faith," was to be the manner of dealing with their opponents, and they are assured that the brotherhood must all act in like manner. Our times are not to be compared with theirs. There is opposition, it is true, and I would that it were confined to the world, with the "form of godliness which is without the power;" but, unfortunately, in these days wherein there is a marked declension from important Truths, opposition comes partly from those who profess the Truth. It is, however, harmless in its *effect*

* Yes, the Greek word rendered "adversary" means an opponent in a suit-at-law.—Ed. S.A.

to kill; it has no swallowing-up power such as beset our brethren who received Peter's Epistle. Nevertheless, brethren, the same kind of resistance is to be given, and associated with the "steadfastness of the faith."

Finally, a comforting assurance is given:—"But the God of all grace who called you to his age-during glory in Christ Jesus, having suffered a little, Himself make you perfect, establish, strengthen, settle you." Paul did also write, "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure;" and it is a very comforting thought to realise that we are not in danger of aid failing us from our Heavenly Father. When we are obedient children God will help. So cheer up, ye toilers, the goal is nearer than it was, and the strength is no less.

"Having suffered a little," I think, is used in the comparative sense; for, although many of their sufferings were very severe and terminated in death by violence (see Heb. xi. 33-37), yet, as compared with the age-during glory that is to follow, it could be, and was, described as "little."

The medium of the letter, Silvanus, is next introduced, and the fewness of the words is mentioned, in which Peter says he has "written exhorting and testifying this to be the true grace of God in which ye stand." It is also nice to read of the salutations of the assembly in Babylon (Rome, I think) jointly-elected, and Markus, his son; and to note the true affection and peace to all who are in Christ Jesus. Amen.

If few in words, this Epistle is very strong in the power and wisdom of Our God; and, in writing upon it, it has not been in any spirit of pride that I have done so, but in the spirit of love, and with the endeavour to bring into juxtaposition other parts of the Word in order to present the meanings of certain words and phrases more fully, so as to be interesting and helpful to the brethren, in however small a way. I rejoice, and I assure all that there has been a willingness and readiness of mind, combined with humility, which I trust will ever remain with myself and you.

WM. WHITEHEAD.

New Romney.

Wandering Out of the Way of Understanding.

"The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead" (Prov. xxi. 16).

The above passage from the inspired pen of Israel's most illustrious and wise king is generally applied to all the Gentiles as expressing their eternal condition when once the gates of Death have closed upon them; but of late some in the household have limited it to the unenlightened Gentiles, i. e., all those who have not come within the sound of the Gospel.

But such an application is inadmis-

sible in view of the fact that the Proverbs, like the Epistles in the New Testament, were written for "instruction and counsel" to the "Israel of God." It is, therefore, obvious that these words, like the words of Promise and Life, were addressed to one and the same people, viz., the "My Son" (Prov. i. 8). The expression "My Son" points to the relationship between Jehovah and the children of Israel (Hosea xi. 1)—a relationship which every son of Israel could enjoy by virtue of being a son of Abraham and of the "circumcision." But for such a national privilege to benefit him

for the "life to come," it was necessary for him to believe and manifest the "faith of Abraham"; otherwise he could only be entitled to the blessings of the Law, which pertained to this life only.

The Law, although ordained for long life, nevertheless brought all under its condemnation.

The Apostle Paul speaks of his power to slay in Rom. vii. 9-10, "For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death."

It will be observed that the Apostle also goes back to a time when he "was alive once without the Law"—a condition into which circumcision had brought him. This rite, although performed by the parents, was the ceremony which made every "son of Abraham" "alive without the Law." It was the initial step to "the way which leadeth to life." It, therefore, became the "son of Abraham" to continue in the "way of understanding" by manifesting the "Faith of Abraham."

The passage under consideration tells us the end of that "Son" or man who has not laid hold of the Faith of Abraham, but has "wandered out of the way of understanding."

Now we think it is obvious that the "wandering out of the way" points unerringly to the conclusion that the "man" was once "in the way of understanding"; hence it is the description of the end of all who "stray," "wander," or "forsake" "the way" into which Divine mercy had brought them by the "covenant made to the Fathers."

This passage can in no way relate to those Gentiles who were never in the "way of understanding"; neither can it apply to the brethren of Christ, of whom it is written "we must all appear before the Judgment Seat of Christ" (2 Cor. v. 10). Hence it can only have an application to some of the lineal descendants of Abraham.

It will be remembered that, while every son of Abraham received the "sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the Faith" (Rom. iv. 11), few followed in the "Faith" and did the "works of Abraham." It was necessary for those who desired to be

"heirs with Abraham of the Promises," as they came to years of maturity to offer sacrifices, and "call upon the Name of the Lord."

These sacrifices, to ascend with acceptance, had to be offered upon the basis of the covenant made with Abraham.

It is written, "Neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy meat offering" (Lev. ii. 13). It will be seen from this that the efficacy of the sacrifices lay in the presence of the "Salt of the Covenant"—that is, that all who offered the sacrifices were to believe and obey in the faith of the covenant. For such the "blood of the everlasting covenant" will avail to bring from "the congregation of the dead" to receive an inheritance in the land with Abraham for ever. Salt being an emblem of incorruption, is a fitting representation of the Abrahamic covenant on account of the everlasting character of that covenant, and in contrast to the Mosaic covenant, which was only temporary.

That man who "wanders out of the way of understanding"—that is, the Son in Israel whose sacrifices were not seasoned with the "Salt of the Covenant," who did not lay hold of the Promises made to Abraham because of unbelief, he, even that "man, shall remain in the congregation of the dead."

Let us, as "sons" in the Israel of God, have "salt in ourselves" that our sacrifices may come up as a sweet-smelling savour, and that we may obtain the blessing, even the "recompense of the reward," when God shall bring us again "from the dead through the Blood of the Everlasting Covenant."

Northampton.

G. HANDLEY.

[This article was in type when our last number was issued, but, for want of space, it had to be omitted. Since then the writer—as will be seen from the Northampton intelligence—has "fallen asleep in Christ," to the regret of all brethren and sisters who knew him. We are glad to have obtained this thoughtful contribution before his probation closed.—Ed. S. K.]

The Zionist Movement.

Since the issue of our last number considerable activity has been shown by some of the supporters of this movement.

On November 20th a debate took place at a meeting of the Article Club, under the presidency of Lord Suffield, on "The Commercial Future of Palestine." At this meeting both Jews and Gentiles were present, and the principal speech, or address, was delivered by Mr. Israel Zangwill, who went very fully into the position of Palestine in the past, its relation to Turkey, and the Gentile powers: its exports, its industries, its geographical position, existing projects for its development by railways, its prospective connection with surrounding countries, and the position of the present Jewish colonies.

Hall Caine and several other Gentiles spoke sympathetically of the movement advocated by Mr. Zangwill.

On December 1st, at a meeting of the Maccabean Club—which is composed principally of artistic and literary Jews—Mr. Hall Caine presided at a lecture by Mr. Israel Zangwill, when the chairman expressed strong sympathy with the Zionist movement. Mr. Zangwill's address was an amplification of the one previously delivered at the Article Club.

On December 14th a mass meeting—one of a series about the same time throughout the Zionist world—was held in Shoreditch Town Hall, which was crowded in every part long before the hour of commencement. Altogether this gathering was a most enthusiastic one.

THE NEW LIBERAL REVIEW (No. 11) for December contains an article of 20 pp. by Israel Zangwill entitled "The Return to Palestine," which is, for the most part, an elaboration of the aforementioned addresses. In this article he gives a pitiable account of the existing

Jewish colonies in Palestine, which are partly on a charitable, and, therefore, he contends, on an unsound basis. He reviews, indeed, the efforts which have been made for the last forty years to ameliorate the condition of the Jews by one means or another, points out their flaws and failures, and forcibly contends that the only solution of the problem is to be found in the Zionist Movement.

An interesting pamphlet, entitled "Zionism: Jewish Aims and Jewish Ideals," has been issued by Mr. J. De Haas, an enthusiastic young Zionist residing in London, in which he gives a review of the political, religious, and economic position of the Jews, discusses their possible future apart from Zionism, and describes the growth in their midst of the Messianic belief.

On the 26th of December the fifth Zionist Congress commenced its sittings at Basle, in Switzerland. In reporting it the *Jewish World* says that it was attended by nearly 300 delegates and 1,000 visitors. Every country and every tongue from South Africa to Manchuria, and from New Zealand to Klondike, sent its representatives; about half the delegates being from Russia, where the Movement, on account of the oppressed condition of the Jew, excites the keenest interest. The principal addresses were made by Dr. Herzl, Sir Francis Montefiore, Dr. Max Nordau, and Mr. Israel Zangwill.

Dr. Herzl reported, of course, his interview with the Sultan, but apparently was not able to make any definite announcement as to results. He said, "the kindness and heartiness of this reception has filled me with great hopes. From the words and bearing of His Majesty I have the feeling that the Jewish people have a friend and patron in the reigning Khalifa. The Sultan has authorised me to say so openly."

A telegram was sent from the Congress to the Sultan which elicited the following reply from Ibrahim Pasha:—

“Placed Congress address of homage telegraphed at foot of throne. By order of His Majesty I hasten to express high Imperial satisfaction.”

The proceedings at the Congress appear to have been of a very enthusiastic character throughout, its results being summarised by Dr. Herzl at its close in the following words:—“New experience had been gained during the days of their deliberations; very much had been done which had strengthened the Movement; the Jewish Colonial Trust had been advanced, the National Fund created, and the organisation had been improved. The Zionist Movement had ceased to be a Utopian dream, and was now entering on the stage of realisation.”

The mere task of sitting at the various meetings of this Congress could not have been a light one, for on the first day the evening meeting, which was the third sitting, did not close until after midnight; on the third day, not until 4.30 a.m.; on the fourth day, not until 3 a.m.; and on the fifth day, not until 4.30 a.m. Between the sittings there were apparently numerous committees which, no doubt, required constant attendance by the office bearers and many of the delegates.

Dr. Herzl appears to have been the “sole and controlling genius” in the whole Congress. An English Jewish delegate says of him that, “to the Jewish nation he is Premier, Foreign Secretary, Ambassador, party manager,

all rolled into one, to which he adds the rôle of Speaker of Parliament and Chairman of Committees with Leader of the House.”

From the fact that the interview with the Sultan has not, as yet, been followed by any definite announcement, it is evident that the time is not ripe for such a step. It may be, as has been suggested, that the opening of Palestine to the Jews on the Zionist basis will not take place until there occurs some political complication among the Gentile nations. If, however, such an event has yet to be awaited, we may be quite sure that the process of preparation which the Movement has undergone during the last five years will have been necessary for the combined fulfilment of the Jewish hopes and the purposes of God.

On the 14th of February Dr. Herzl, in response to a telegraphic invitation from the Sultan, arrived at Constantinople, accompanied by Mr. Joseph Cowen, one of the Governors of the Jewish Colonial Trust. After a stay of four days they returned home. No announcement has yet been made as to the object, or result of the visit, but it is, no doubt, connected with the Zionist movement, and the invitation may be due to the fact, recently announced in the Press, that the Porte is in great straits for money.

In an article in *Household Words* for February 22nd, on the Zionist movement, by Israel Zangwill, it is suggested that there may yet be a Jewish Republic in Palestine, with Dr. Herzl as its first President.

EDITOR.

Our Letter Box.

DANIEL XII. 11.

H. B., commenting on the article in the last number of the SANCTUARY-KEEPER, on “DANIEL’S SEVEN TIMES,” agrees with the main facts, and the remarkable signs of Israel’s awakening, and end of Jewish times; but does not follow the reasoning with regard to the

time of the Second Advent. Taking a broader view of the prophetic times, in relation to later-day developments, he considers that allowing 1927-8 as the end of the seven times of Israel’s downtreading, there are also the Gentile times, ending some 20 to 30 years earlier,

1901-10, to be taken into account. Also, the 1,260 years of the Papal Horn-Power, which ended in 1870, must not be overlooked. If these times affect spiritual Israel after the type of Israel's deliverance from Egypt, may not the non-appearance of Christ at the end of the 1,290 years, or the present year, be explained by the fact that there is a little margin in the 3½ years left over from the 70 weeks of Daniel, which should be added on to the 1,290.* Of one thing, says H. B., we may be certain: the signs in the political heavens are unmistakable, and as members of the One Body desirous of being included

* We do not think that any portion of the Seventy Weeks is still unfulfilled, and cannot, therefore, entertain the above suggested explanation.—F. D., S. K.

in the "Bride," which "maketh herself ready," let us "so run" that we may obtain a place in His glorious Kingdom.

A Sister ("Prove all Things") would like answers to the following questions, which we submit for the consideration of our readers:—

Rom. vi. 5.—"For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection."

When does the planting take place?

1 John iii. 9.—"Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God."

Can we say that we are without sin now?

Within the Holy Place.

ABERGAVERNNY.

5, Monk Street: Sunday, 11 a.m. and 6-30, Wednesday (Bible Class) 8 p.m.

Since the formation of our ecclesia our numbers have been augmented by Annie and Edith Bennet, who have accepted the tenets of the truth and cast aside the traditions and commandments of men. Being so isolated from other ecclesias, and having to rely upon our own lecturing abilities, it is only by great efforts that we are able to keep "our room" on. Yet we continue to trust that some "fruit of our labours" may soon be forthcoming to encourage us. We shall be extremely glad of the help of any brothers who may be passing this way.

J. PRICE.

BRISTOL.

We have not much to report, except that we have had the pleasure of a visit from Sister Sawtell, of Glastonbury, and Sister Rushforth, of Abergavenny. We shall be pleased to welcome any brother, or sister, of "like precious faith," who may happen to come this way. Our

address is 14, Shaftesbury Avenue, Montpelier, Bristol.

W. PALMER.

BURNLEY.

It is with great pleasure that I write to inform you that we, as an Ecclesia, have agreed to report our unity of mind with you respecting the question of resurrectional responsibility, and the nature of Christ.

That is to say, we, the undersigned, heartily believe that Christ, by His death, was cleansed from His own sin-nature, which came by condemnation in Adam, and that we, being buried into His death by baptism, must likewise partake of that justification, as well as being forgiven our personal sins.

Also, that resurrection and appearance at the Judgment Seat of Christ are for the receipt of reward and punishment for those only who have come under law to God.

And that the Basis of Faith, published and held by the Ecclesia meeting at Barnsbury Hall, London, is in entire accordance with Divine Truth.

We meet for breaking of bread on Sunday afternoon at 12.30 p.m., at my house, 270, Cog Lane, Burnley; and it would give us great pleasure to meet with any of the same faith who may come this way.

BRO. ASHWORTH BARLOW.
SISTER ISABELLA BARLOW.
SISTER ALICE RILEY.
SISTER EMMA GREGORY.
SISTER ALICE KAY.
SISTER EDITH BARLOW.

ASHWORTH BARLOW.

HOVE (BRIGHTON).

Since our last report, we have continued to sow the seed of the kingdom, and, I am glad to say, that our labours have been rewarded. We had a visit from Bro. Strange, Barnsbury Hall, who spent his holiday here, and broke bread with us on August 4th and 11th; also from Bro. J. Davies from the Mumbles, Wales, who spent a few months with us, but returned to Wales on November 17th; and also, on November 24th, from Bro. Mockford, from Camberwell, who was a great help in exhorting and lecturing.

On December 1st we were very pleased to get a visit from Bro. Pattenden, who has been some time in isolation at Sevenoaks; and on January 5th from Sister Annie Roberts, of Barnsbury Hall. We shall be pleased to see any others of like precious faith.

Miss E. Brooks, age 20, who for some time has been looking into the truth, embraced its teaching as she told her Bible Class teacher, "with her own free will;" she passed through the waters of baptism, thereby putting on Christ, on December 3rd.

We have added to our Library the bound vol. 1-6 of the SANCTUARY KEEPER, with the "Blood of the Covenant," and we would strongly urge other brethren to do likewise.

We also had a visit from Bro. J. Owler, of Barnsbury Hall, on February 2nd, who helped us by an exhortation and a lecture.

With respect to brethren taking their holidays, I shall be very pleased to furnish any with a list of reliable apartments at Hove, where they will receive a hearty welcome from those in the Bond of the Covenant.

C. R. MOSLEY, Recording Bro.
10, Wordsworth Street, Hove.

JERSEY.

Faithful proclamation of the truth has for some time past shown no visible result. Cheering signs of an opposite character are at last causing hope and grateful rejoicing.

N. J. PRIGG, Recording Bro.

ST. LEONARD'S.

Since our last report we have no special news to chronicle, save that we have been visited by our Sister Greenhalgh, and the Brethren Carlow, of Cowden. We spent a very profitable time in Scripture research.

Our Sister Hadden has been seriously ill, but we rejoice that health has now been restored.

Our usual outdoor efforts were continued through the summer months of last year. We had many apparently attentive listeners, and we trust they will take heed to the truth laid before them ere it be too late.

F. G. W. SIMMONS.

LONDON (NORTH).

BARNSBURY HALL, BARNSBURY STREET, N. Sundays, 11 a.m. and 7 p.m.; Wednesday, 8 p.m.

It is gratifying to be able to report that since the last number of the SANCTUARY KEEPER was issued, we have been cheered by the introduction into the Saving Name of Mrs. Florence Home and Miss Amy Ethel Davey, who were immersed on 12th January; also of Miss Mina Isabella Owler (youngest daughter of Bro. and Sister W. Owler), who passed through the baptismal waters on 9th February. We earnestly pray that they, with us, may be found worthy in the day of His coming.

Our usual tea meeting was held on Boxing Day, and proved interesting and instructive.

The attendance at the lectures is fairly well maintained, some amount of interest having been aroused by our inviting questions from visitors.

We take this opportunity of acknowledging anonymous contributions of £5 and 2s. 6d.; also £3 14s. (from Jersey), to our Poor Fund, timely assistance which is most gratefully appreciated.

JOHN OWLER,
Recording Bro.

LONDON (SOUTH).

SURREY MASONIC HALL, CAMBERWELL
NEW ROAD, S.E.

We are pleased to report that our Bro. Albert Addison and our Sister Elizabeth Woods were joined together in marriage on 31st October, 1901.

Also that William Robert Jeacock, in obedience to the command, was immersed on December 29th, 1901, after a good confession.

We have also to report that our Bro. W. Richards, sen., father in the flesh to our Bro. W. F. Richards, fell asleep on January 3rd, 1902, and was laid to rest on Monday, 6th January, 1902, full of hope, in the assurance that the Lord, the righteous Judge, will raise him again from the dust of the earth to stand in his lot at the end of the days.

NEW ROMNEY.

We have had the pleasure of a visit from our Bro. Prett, from Sandway, near Maidstone, since I last wrote you; and we have also had staying for some weeks with our Bro. Cook, Bro. Albert Hall, of the Great George Street Ecclesia, Leeds, a very worthy young brother, who is anxious for other brethren to understand the true object and nature of the Sacrifice of Christ, and the present freedom from the condemnation in Adam of all who are baptised into Christ's Name according to the Scripture. I have pleasure in enclosing a statement written by our brother on this point.

W. WHITEHEAD.

THE "EDENIC LAW" AND THE "DEATH PASSED UPON ALL MEN."

God placed Adam under a law in Eden, by which Adam was liable to a death by slaying on the day of transgression.

After the law had been broken, but prior to the passing of sentence upon the transgressors, God, by an exercise of mercy, introduced another law in the promise of the woman's seed, who was to take away the sin (Gen. iii. 15).

Hence for the accomplishment of this, when God passed sentence upon Adam, the penalty of the law was modified (Gen. iii. 17-19).

When Paul says "death passed upon all men" (Rom. v. 12), he refers to the death mentioned in Gen. iii. 19.

It was from this death that Christ came to redeem us.

But how are we redeemed therefrom?

Death by decay could not take away sin, for God's law declares "without the shedding of blood there can be no remission of sins;" therefore a sacrificial death, or death by slaying, alone could meet the requirements.

In this we see the justice of God in demanding the sacrificial death of his Son, by which He, for Himself, obtained eternal redemption.

All who are baptised into Christ partake of the efficacy of His sacrificial death, whereby death hath no longer dominion over them.

The principle upon which God inaugurated that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin" (by which law it was *not possible* for the bitter cup to pass from Jesus) is that Adam, by his sin, incurred a death by slaying; hence a death by slaying alone could take away that sin, and redeem those under the sentence of death from its dominion.

ALBERT HALL.

NORTHAMPTON.

LODGE ROOM, TEMPERANCE HALL.
Sundays, 11 and 6.30.

We deeply regret to report the death of our dear Bro. Handley, who fell asleep in Jesus on 27th November last, aged 40. Our brother earnestly desired to live until the return of Christ, but his supreme hope was to attain to "glory, honour, and immortality in the Kingdom of God," and we all trust that this hope will be realised by him.

Our brother was fully sensitive to the evils of the human race, and it was a constant source of joy to him that he knew of the future deliverance in store.

We laid him to rest on the following Sunday morning, Bro. W. Owler, of London, kindly coming down to conduct the funeral, and otherwise labour in the "Truth."

I need hardly say how much we all sympathise with Sister Handley in her bereavement, and pray that our Heavenly Father will give her strength and consolation in her sad trouble.

We have been assisted in our work by Brethren J. J. Andrew, R. H. Ford, R. Overton, J. Owler, C. Balls, W. A. Wille, and F. Mockford. We trust their efforts will be rewarded both now and hereafter.

T. E. BODDINGTON,
Recording Bro.

INDEX TO VOL. VIII.

| | PAGE. | | PAGE. |
|--|-------|---|----------------|
| Alienation, by R. H. Ford .. | 93 | " Fraternal Visitor " on the | |
| Alienation and Justification .. | 59 | Advocate and Inspiration .. | 14 |
| An All-Important Question (Poetry), by J. J. Andrew .. | 70 | Future of Egypt .. | 11 |
| Baptismal Belief .. 1, 25, 49, | 73 | Herzl's (Dr.) Visit to the | |
| Birth of Spirit, by N. J. Prigg .. | 41 | Sultan .. | 57 |
| Canadian Declaration .. | 59 | Inspiration, Bro. Genders on .. | 14 |
| Daniel xii. 11 and 12, by R. H. Ford | 37 | Japanese Treaty .. | 15, 30 |
| Daniel's 70 Weeks, by R. H. Ford | 6 | Lord Rosebery and Liberal | |
| Foundation of the Adamic Sinful | | Party .. | 30 |
| Race .. | 46 | Origin of the SANGREARY | |
| For What are we Baptised? .. | 83 | KEEPER .. | 80 |
| Holy Spirit, Gifts of .. | 29 | Pamphlet, by Bro. Richards .. | 15 |
| Inspiration Items .. | 31 | Pamphlet, by A. D. Strickler .. | 58 |
| Imputed Sin .. | 85 | Prophetic Mistakes .. | 11 |
| Justice-Mercy, by John Owler .. | 39 | Resolution passed by North | |
| Luke i. 3 .. | 67 | of England Ecclesias .. | 31 |
| Notes on Prophetic Times, by J. Campbell .. | 90 | Rhodes, Will of Cecil .. | 30 |
| Reflections, by John Owler .. | 39 | Singing, Bro. Sulley on .. | 59 |
| Reply to Bro. Campbell, by C. H. Evans .. | 34 | Thanks to Subscribers .. | 11 |
| Resurrection through Covenant | | Our Letter Box :— 21, 44, 70, 88 | |
| Blood .. | 82 | Conscription .. | 89 |
| Spiritual Workmanship, by J. J. Andrew .. | 62 | Did Christ Die for Himself? .. | 44 |
| Things New and Old, by W. Whitehead .. | 15 | Daniel xii. 11 .. | 21 |
| Trumpets of Assembly and Alarm, by R. H. Ford .. | 55 | God's Command to Repent .. | 71 |
| Truth and Error (Poetry) .. | 43 | Justifying the Flesh .. | 89 |
| Wandering out of the Way of Un- derstanding, by the late G. Hand- ley .. | 18 | No Resurrection out of Christ .. | 70 |
| Zionist Movement, The .. | 20 | Questions by a Sister .. | 22 |
| Editorial Flyleaf :— 11, 30, 57, | 80 | Resurrection to Condemnation .. | 88 |
| Blood of the Covenant, Stock | | Things Hard to be Understood .. | 92 |
| nearly exhausted .. | 30 | Baptism and Circumcision .. | 42 |
| Buffalo Statement .. | 57 | Planted in the Likeness of | |
| Baptismal Belief .. | 81 | Christ's Death and Resur- rection .. | 92 |
| Baptism, Bro. Sulley on .. | 58 | He Cannot Sin .. | 92 |
| Canadian Declaration .. | 57 | Within the Holy Place .. 22, 47, 71, 95 | |
| "Christadelphian," Critic- isms of the .. | 12 | Abergavenny .. | 22 |
| Christians and the Holy Land .. | 57 | Bastord .. | 95 |
| Collections, Bro. Sulley on .. | 13 | Bristol .. | 22, 47, 95 |
| Conscription .. | 58 | Burnley .. | 22, 95 |
| Dam Across the Nile .. | 11 | Hove (Sussex) .. | 23, 47, 71, 95 |
| Daniel's Seventy Weeks .. | 11 | Jersey, Channel Islands .. | |
| Editor's Health .. | 30 | 23, 47, 71 | |
| Editor's Parting Words .. | 81 | Kendal .. | 71 |
| | | Liverpool .. | 48, 72 |
| | | London (North) .. | 23, 47, 71, 95 |
| | | London (South) .. | 24, 47, 72, 96 |
| | | New Romney .. | 24, 48, 72, 96 |
| | | Northampton .. | 24, 48, 72, 96 |
| | | St. Leonards .. | 23, 47 |
| | | Sydney (New South Wales) .. | 96 |