



The Australasian Christian Standard.

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."—1 Thess. 5: 21.

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY.

VOL. X—No. 6.

MELBOURNE, MARCH 14, 1895.

Subscription 5/- per annum post free.

Current Topics.

THE RETURN TO CHRIST.
—We are glad to find the *Christian Commonwealth* speaking out its mind on the cry that has been raised of late, which, under the guise of a "return to Christ," means the ignoring of his authority. It says:—"We have been hearing for some time about the importance of going back to Christ. We fear that much of this talk will practically amount to nothing. Some of it may have a misleading tendency. If a return to Christ means that we must ignore the primitive Church and the Apostles it is by no means certain that such a return is at all desirable. We have more than once called attention to the fact that any legitimate backward movement must include everything with which Christ is associated, and especially His Word, His Church, and His Apostles. It is easy to take up a cry of 'back to Christ,' which has in it nothing but ruin for all that Christ came to establish. Whenever we go the other side of Christ's coronation in the heavens we are at once out of line with the dispensation in which we live; and when we go the other side of His death, burial, and resurrection, we are practically beyond the limits of His saving power; for any gospel that saves must include the three fundamental facts referred to by the Apostle in the fifteenth chap-

ter of First Corinthians. We do not therefore regard all that is said on the question of going back to Christ as indicating a healthy reaction."

AN EXCEPTION.—"Nevertheless," it continues, "we are glad that even Socialists are compelled to go to Christ for the best ideals of the coming century. Mr. Fletcher, the editor of the *Daily Chronicle*, has prophesied through *Great Thoughts* concerning the future. Among other things he says: 'I believe that the twentieth century will make progress by going backward. The unemployed multitudes will be put back on the land; industrially we shall go back to the ideals of an age when every artisan was an artist, and every labourer a landholder; and politically we shall endeavour to go back to Nazareth, back to Christ, by bravely endeavouring to bring legislation into line with His teaching.' Now, all this sounds very well, but it will never be realized unless it is brought about by the Church of God. No organized Socialism outside of the body of Christ will ever meet the case. It is, therefore, most important that the primitive Church should be restored in all of its vital principles and practices. The true remedy for all our evils can be found only in a return to Christ, a return to His Apostles, and a return to the Primitive Church. The first will give us the simple but comprehensive creed

of the New Testament; the second will give us the pure, beautiful gospel; the third will give us exactly the Socialism which is needed for this restless, struggling, turbulent age.

MISTAKES ABOUT THE BIBLE.—In Dr. Verco's instructive paper reference is made to the first chapter and first verse of Daniel, where it is stated, "in the *third year* of Jehoiakim, King of Judah, came Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, unto Jerusalem and besieged it." This apparently contradicts another statement in Jeremiah 25, in which it says that the event took place in the *fourth year* of the reign of Jehoiakim. By reading Dr. Verco's paper, this apparent discrepancy will be explained. The explanation being found in the fact that Daniel used the Babylonian method of reckoning, which was different to the Jewish. We refer to this now in order to show its bearing upon the authorship of the Book of Daniel. There is nothing about which destructive critics are more certain than that Daniel did not write the book bearing his name. They assign its date to the Maccabean period and its authorship to some unknown Jew. But the apparent mistake in regard to the year in which Jerusalem was besieged affords strong corroborative evidence that its author was none other than Daniel himself. A writer in the

last number of *The Thinker*, thus speaks:—"How did the writer of Daniel come to use the Babylonian method? If the writer was Daniel himself the answer is easy; no other method would occur to him. He had been trained to it from his youth and used it all his life. But if the writer was a Jew in the Holy Land, writing as late as, say, B.C. 168, and laying the scene of his book in Babylon from B.C. 605 downward, how did he come to compute after the Babylonian fashion? It may be thought that, unless he was careless, he could not commit the anomaly of making Daniel write as a Jew in Palestine. But how did he know that it would have been an anomaly for Daniel to say the "fourth year"? It may be supposed that the descendants of the exiles were familiar with Babylonian methods. That, however, is not in keeping with what we know of them."

He goes on to show that the writers of the Maccabean period were ignorant of the Babylonian method, and consequently that the book must have been written by one who lived at the time the events took place. Other instances could be cited which prove that the author used the method referred to, and therefore we are warranted in concluding from this circumstance alone that another mistake lies at the door of the "higher critics."

THE MISSING LINK.—We sometimes hear of the "Missing link" being found, but it never seems to live long, hence we find a recent writer saying, "The world of science has commenced to disbelieve in missing links. In despair of explaining away the immense gulf between the lowliest man and the most highly developed ape, some of the keenest of evolutionists have given up the task. Darwin was logical and consistent to the last, and carried the origin of species to its humblest beginnings, but Mr. Wallace seems now inclined to admit that man came into existence by something

like a miracle, and in so doing he virtually abandoned the whole doctrine of evolution."

The Australasian

Christian Standard.

(Published every alternate Thursday.)

MELBOURNE, MARCH 14th, 1893.

F. G. DUNN, 251 Swanston-st., Melbourne.
A. B. MASTON, 543 Elizabeth-st., Melbourne.

Publisher's Notices.

Articles for publication (which should be as brief as possible) to be addressed to "Editors, care of A. B. Maston."

Subscriptions, 5/- per annum, post free, to any part of the world. Resubscribers should be made to

M. McLELLAN, Manager and Publisher,
251 Swanston-st., Melbourne.

PURITY, PEACE, UNITY, LOVE, POWER.

MOSES OR CHRIST.

C PROPER conception of the relation of the Old Testament to the New is an essential factor to the proper understanding of the Bible. And although this is a truism which none would call in question, it is wonderful how few there are who give any evidence that they have arrived at a correct understanding of what that relation is. To many the Bible is simply a book from which to cull texts without any regard to the occasion on which they were written. In some cases this may be put down to ignorance or want of thought, but in others we are afraid it is the result of design, prompted by a desire to gain some particular end. In the past as a people we were pretty well posted up in the connection between the Old and the New Dispensations. Numerous debates on the subject of baptism were splendid educational means for enabling us to discern the difference between the law of Moses and the

law of Christ. The upholders of pseudo-baptist views were never happy unless they were bringing forward some Mosaic citation to sustain their notions of Christian teaching. Circumcision and the covenants were always happy hunting grounds for them to rove in, and if they failed in making any logical use of them they always had the satisfaction of raising a dust, behind which they might retire to hide their confusion. We were therefore compelled in those days to be discriminating students of the Bible. We knew all about the patriarchal, the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, and were not easily led astray by irrelevant arguments. We do not think our older brethren have forgotten the lessons they learned in the past, but we think it quite possible that some of those who have joined our ranks of late years may have some important lessons to learn in regard to this matter. In any case, both old and young disciples require to have their minds refreshed by occasional reminders of great elementary truths. Veterans, who require no reminding, are always pleased to see their old friends, and novices have everything to gain by making their acquaintance.

Ninety-nine times out of a hundred it may be regarded as a sign of weakness when the Old Testament is mainly used to prove the validity of some practice in connection with the Christian Church, and it may be taken for granted that that which cannot be sustained from the New Testament is open, to say the least of it, to very strong suspicion. Unquestionably, lessons of the highest import may be drawn from the pages of the older record, but these must always be understood in the light of the clearer, and more perfect revelation. In fine, we must distinguish between the spiritual childhood of our race and its maturer years and

perceive that the revelation of God's will was adapted to each condition.

It may be asked, "Why did God not give a perfect revelation at first?" "Why do we find three distinct periods, viz., the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, and the Christian?" Leaving out of consideration the first of these, we discover in the conditions under which the Mosaic economy was instituted ample reasons for a less complete revelation than was afterwards given, and which culminated in Christ. We have to bear in mind the condition of the Israelites as they came forth from the land of Egypt. They came from a land in which they had been slaves for many long years, and from an environment in which idolatry was rampant. They carried the marks of their slavery with them, and the impress which the idolatrous practices of their masters had left upon them took long years to efface. After crossing the Red Sea, they were a vast multitude of people without law and incapable of instituting laws for their own proper guidance. This great want God Himself supplied, and in such a way as to suit their mental and spiritual condition. The first vital lesson they required to learn was, that there was but one God, not many. As showing how God stooped down to their childish condition, we have only to note the prohibition to make graven images, or the likeness of anything. How hard it was for them to learn and practice the first commandment, is seen in those frequent relapses into idolatry, and their consequent punishment in the seventy years' exile in Babylon, after which salutary lesson we hear of no more relapses into idolatry. The idea of God's oneness became fixed, and from this they have never since departed.

And so we find Paul speaking of the law as a schoolmaster. The

Greek word is *pedagogue*, and 'school-master' scarcely gives the correct idea. The *pedagogue* was a trusted servant who had charge of the child, and might be his tutor, or might lead him to the teacher's house. The latter idea, we think, is preferable. The function of the law, then, was to lead all under it to Christ. But "the faith" having come, of which Christ was the author, the services of the law or *pedagogue* were no longer required. As Robertson puts it: "There was a time when the world's minority, and a time when the world came of age. These times are marked by two different stages of feeling—bondage and liberty; and from two different principles of action—acting from law and acting from faith. There was a time when Moses was the world's schoolmaster, and the time when Christ became the world's higher teacher." The first was a law of restraint, the second a law of liberty. Restraint for the child, liberty for the man; but under law in each case. It has been well observed that "The moral law, as understood by the light of nature, or under the revelation of the Old Testament, is sufficiently terrible to our consciences; the Sermon on the Mount is severer still." There may be freedom from certain restraints which characterised the old condition of things, but on the other hand there are in the new, obligations of a spiritual character which extend further and are equally imperative. Under the Old it was said, "Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment;" but under the New it is, "Every one that is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment." The first takes cognizance of the overt act, but the second goes behind the act, and condemns not only it but the cause which brought the act into being. Much more might be cited

of a similar nature, but enough has been said to indicate not only the superiority of the latter to the former, but also to plainly show that we do not take our law from Moses but from Christ. There was some excuse for the Jewish Christians of apostolic days for being slow to break the bonds of Judaism and enjoy to the full the higher liberty of the Gospel age, but no such excuse can be urged in extenuation of the conduct of those who, with no Judaic training, seek to revive its precepts and practices—who would make the law of Christ bend to the law of Moses.

Sensible men and women—real seekers after truth, do not turn away from the glorious Sun of Righteousness shining in the firmament of the present dispensation, and seek their spiritual illumination in the pale, cold rays of the moon of Mosaic legalism; they do not turn from the perfect to the imperfect—to do so would indeed be an act of folly, dishonouring both to Christ and to ourselves. Let us, instead, ponder well the words of the Apostle Paul, "But we all, with unveiled face, reflecting as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit."

Editorial Notes.

The Final Test—On taking up the daily paper during the past few days we notice a great deal has been said about "the final test match." About 100,000 people assembled during the five days of the cricket match. The Colonics seemed to be in a state of excitement as to who was to be victor in the "final test." It has transpired that the Englishmen are still ahead of the Colonics in the cricket field. But how did they prove superiority in the "test"? Not by words, but by deeds. It was by patient and determined action they showed their prowess in the field. How will it be with us brethren at the "final test"? It will not be so much by our words as by our actions

we will be tested. Shall we hear the approving words, "Inasmuch as you have *done it* into one of the least of these: my brethren, ye have done it unto Me?" Let us keep in view the "final test."

Church Statistics.—The *Victorian Churchman* is of opinion that the official records of Victoria since 1854 in regard to church statistics "give a conclusive answer to the despairing pessimists within the church as well as to the triumphant *outsiders* without who talk of the decay of church attendance." After giving the table of figures it says: "These figures are very gratifying. They show that the proportion of church-goers in the population has been steadily increasing, until it has risen from 17 per cent. in 1854 to 42 per cent. in 1893, and if anything it is somewhat larger in the present year. Then, allowance must be made, not merely for children under five, who are about one-eighth of the population, and for people of advanced years, but also for mothers of families and others whose domestic duties of necessity keep them at home. That the people of Victoria are less inclined to go to church than they used to be, is an assertion absolutely contradicted by facts."

"**Liberal Brethren.**"—We have been having a lot of talk lately about liberal brethren and liberal views, &c. As we understand it, a man to be liberal must have something of his own to be liberal with. A man who is liberal with what belongs to somebody else we call dishonest, that is in connection with things of every day life. Now the New Testament either does or does not teach something on all questions affecting Christian life and duty. When it speaks on any given question, to the man loyal to the truth the controversy is ended, and the man who in the name of liberality tries to subvert that word, is acting dishonestly instead of liberally. The word of God, rightly divided and properly interpreted, is an end of all controversy. We can be just as liberal as our neighbour when we happen to have anything of our own to be liberal with, but we do not care to build up a reputation in this respect on things belonging to others.

The Hand of Fellowship.—Fortunately extending the right hand of fellowship is a common occurrence in many, if not most of our churches. We are always glad when it is so. We wish to say that we think the very most should be made of it, to impress for good not only those being received, but maybe those who have been travellers along Zion's way for many years. Under no circumstance should it be allowed to drift into a mere formality. We were present a few Sunday mornings ago in the church at Enmore, when some six or seven were then received. The presiding brother may have

been able to do this service well enough, but for some reason called on Dr. Joseph King-bury. It may be the custom here; if so, it is a good one. We were deeply and solemnly impressed. The words spoken were not many; they were few and well chosen. The results of becoming Christians and the responsibilities of the life they were expected to live was briefly pointed out, and they were exhorted to live for Christ. Only a few minutes were occupied, but we felt much good was done.

The Fellowship.—The *Bible Advocate* in its "Open Council" column has a series of articles from the pen of Bro. J. Grinstead in which various matters are discussed in a conversational form. In one of these articles he deals with the question of the "fellowship," and notices an erroneous conception which some hold in regard to it, viz. that some "contended that it should only be attended to on a Sunday in the one collection." To show the absurdity of this he points out that *katachiza* means distributing as well as collecting, and consequently to confer the term to the one idea of collecting is erroneous. This is the main point that he seeks to make. The "one collection" idea of course cannot be sustained, but what position Bro. Grinstead would assume towards an intelligent use of the words, attending to the fellowship, we do not know. We should imagine that he would scarcely say that it was "absurd" for a presiding brother to say that "the church will now attend to the fellowship" simply because for the time being the contributing part was only being attended to. No one objects to a presiding brother saying we will now attend to "the breaking of bread" although the words literally mean attendance to one act, but by well understood usage take in "drinking the cup" as well. Nevertheless the same hypocritical spirit could just as well call the one phrase "absurd" as the other. As a collection is never taken up without the intention of distributing it, the word "fellowship" is quite appropriately used in reference to it, and the absurdity in the matter rests with the objectors thereto. As a matter of fact in apostolic usage we find the idea of collection sometimes predominates in the word *katachiza* (although of course the idea of distribution is never lost sight of) as in Rom 15: 26, where we have reference to a "certain contribution," and again in 2 Cor 9: 13, "The liberality of your contribution." It would be well, we think, if brethren used a little more discernment in their interpretation of scripture.

Pulpit Attraction.—An old preacher in a recent issue of the *Age*, says some good things in reference to the best way to make the pulpit attractive. He does not think fine oratory an absolute necessity, but that

moderate ability goes a long way if the preacher is in sympathy with the people in his life conflicts. From long experience, he would say "that the pulpit can only be made more attractive by that which leads to it, i.e., a consistent house to house visitation, not only those who attend the church or chapel, but the bringing of the sunshine of a better hope into the homes of the thousands who do not go to church. Many of these never obtain a kindly expression; are struggling with powerful physical and mental temptations; are worsted in the daily conflict to live and to bring up their families; and one need not wonder that they prefer the altar to the preacher, and in many cases the public-house to the church. I believe—nay, I know—that a deep interest shown to folk outside the pulpit, makes the pulpit more attractive."

Twynholm House.—Eighteen months have elapsed since Messrs. Sydney Black and R. Wilson Black obtained the lease of the great building at Fulham Cross then known as the Queen Anne Coffee Tavern, and now known as Twynholm House. The big building which was built fourteen years ago as a new public-house, but for which the owner or owners failed to obtain a license, has passed through some vicissitudes. In the latter part of its time it had been largely in the hands of Mr. Roydhouse, mineral water manufacturer, by whom the lease was transferred to Messrs. Black, the well known evangelists. It was mainly through the munificence of the father of these gentlemen, Mr. Robert Black, of St. Kensington, a man who has in an unostentatious manner been the means of doing a great amount of good that the "Queen Anne" Tavern was obtained for the purpose of a religious and social mission. Mr. R. Black gave a cheque for £1,000, and this, together with £1,000 more subscribed by friends who appreciated the value of Messrs. Black's mission in the Australian colonies, has formed the major part of the money since expended on the building at Fulham Cross. Twynholm House has during the last year undergone the most extensive alterations. The basement has been reconstructed; at the rear of the building a handsome and commodious assembly hall capable of seating 500 or 600 people, has been erected; and soup-kitchens, class-rooms and club-rooms added. There are two capital entrances to the hall, one opening into Baystone road, and the other into Lillie-road, the latter, which is the principal, having a handsome stone vestibule. With regard to the work which is to be carried on among the teeming population of Fulham Cross, it is of a very various and very grand character. It has a social as well as a religious side. Many know that the spiritual work has its focus in the Church of Christ, College-street, Chelsea, where the Messrs. Black have labored for many years.

Mistakes About the Bible.

PREFACE.

The following paper was prepared for the "University Christian Union," of the University of Adelaide, and delivered as a lecture at its monthly meeting in September, 1891. A week or so later it was read at the Annual Conference of Churches of Christ in South Australia. Necessarily, it partakes largely of the nature of a compilation; all its facts, and the objections refuted by these facts, being derived from various books. My chief sources of information have been the pages of THE AUSTRALASIAN CHRISTIAN STANDARD, edited by Mr. F. G. Dunn, of Melbourne; a series of admirable publications, entitled "By-Paths of Bible Knowledge," issued by the Religious Tract Society of London; and "The Empire of the Hittites," by Wm. Wright, D.D., kindly lent me by Mr. A. T. Magarey, of Adelaide. I acknowledge freely and with pleasure my great indebtedness to them all, and trust to obtain still more "faith and knowledge" in the same easy and pleasant way from their further labors in this wide and ever-widening field of research.

THE purpose of my paper is to strengthen our faith in the truth of the Bible. This might be attempted in various ways. But I will confine myself to one line of argument. The facts which might be marshalled along even this one line are so numerous as to forbid a reference to them all, and will allow only a hasty glance at some of the strongest and most interesting.

What a household word has the phrase "Higher Criticism" become. And to many it has a fearful sound. It seems to embody the antagonism of a well established science to the word of God, and to threaten the overthrow of our belief in this as a divine revelation. It gathers up vast numbers of undeniable facts, draws from them apparently incontestable conclusions, contrasts them with the Scripture record, and demonstrates its serious departure from truth, and therefore the impossibility of receiving it as inspired of God. And so their faith changes to doubt, they begin to question the accuracy of the good old Book, and to lose their reverence for it, their attachment to it, and their confidence in it.

Of late years, the attention of scholars has been largely directed to the Old Testament, and its history and prophecy have been closely and thoroughly scrutinised; with the result that all sorts of errors and corruptions and falsifications have been discovered. Books attributed to one man have been proved—yes proved—to have been written by two or more. Prophecies uttered, or supposed to have been uttered before certain events, have been shown by these highly educated men to have been written after the occurrence of the incidents predicted, and hence are forged prophecies palmed off upon the credulous. And the consequence is, we are liable to lose confidence in Isaiah and Daniel and Moses, because they are only *nomes-de-plume* for all kinds of people, who concocted all manner of stories, at various periods of time, and in order to give them credibility, have attributed them to Moses and Daniel, who had no more to do with them than you or I.

Now what I want to do is this, to show how little this Higher Criticism is to be feared, because it is so little to be trusted. It has already made so many egregious blunders, that it cannot expect us to repose any very implicit confidence in it. This can be demonstrated over and over again, by instances which cannot be denied. The critic has taken a certain assertion in the Book. He has said: "This is not true, it cannot be possibly true; and this is the reason why it cannot be true." And after he has said this over several times, some other scientific man has appeared on the scene with a brick in his hand, and shown that this Bible narrative IS true, even to the satisfaction of the Higher Critic himself. But as bold as ever he replies: "Though the Bible is absolutely right in that particular, it is absolutely false in this;" and here he cites another scientific deduction, and gives another scripture quotation. And once more, after he has loudly defied the word of God, some scientific David picks up a stone out of the brook, and with one twirl of his sling, smites him in the forehead, and the Philistine champion is in the dust.

Now it seems to me only reasonable, that every instance adduced, in which a definite charge of inaccuracy has been levelled against the Bible by the critic, on scientific grounds, and has subsequently been shown to be an unfounded charge (shown in such an unmistakeable and forcible manner, by facts which cannot be gainsaid, that the critic himself is compelled to acknowledge it), every such instance must weaken our respect for the critic, and must discount any further criticism offered. And when we find these refuted charges accumulating by the score, may we not begin to question whether we need pay so much deference to Bible criticism, and may we not, while we listen attentively to the objector, be quite justified in holding to the accuracy of the divine word.

Should we not thus act in secular affairs? Suppose we had a bosom friend, whom we had implicitly trusted all our life. Then comes A, and says: "Your friend is not reliable, he has told you what is not true about such a matter." He adduces his facts, and really it does seem as though a gross falsehood had been perpetrated. But after our mind has been worried for awhile, B, communicates another fact, of which A was ignorant. This puts a different complexion upon whole case, and confirms our friend's integrity, and refutes the accusation of falsehood. A, acknowledges his mistake, and our confidence in him is scarcely shaken. But soon he returns with another charge of falsehood, and has an equally convincing array of facts, and we cannot see exactly where there is any fallacy; and again we are disturbed about our friend's untruthfulness. But in process of time we talk it over with D, and he produces a document, which proves A to be wrong again, and our friend to be true to the very letter. Our reliance upon the judgment of A, is further shaken, and while we do not for an instant question his sincerity or his love for truth, we are beginning to suspect his infallibility. Now when he advances a third time, with other irrefragable evidence of our friend's departure from veracity, shall we not retort, "See here, Mr. A., you have impugned the truth of my friend twice, and have been proved wrong yourself. I will note your statement of facts, and your incontestable conclusion, and your charge of falsehood; but I shall, nevertheless, continue to believe in my old friend, for, so far, I have found his character a great deal more trustworthy than your judgment." Such

should be our attitude towards the Higher Criticism in its relation to the word of God.

Now let me draw your attention to a few examples of the inaccuracies of the Higher Critics. Some of them are very simple and superficial, and are easily followed. Others are rather intricate, and a little mental concentration may be required to follow their course. But I will try to make them as plain as circumstances will permit.

Renan, the writer of "The Life of Jesus," in his History of Israel expressed his conviction that the Hebrew account of the events recorded in the four books of Moses, in Joshua and Judges, could not possibly have been written during the period in which the events therein described took place. The story must have been written at a much later date. The reason why he came to this conclusion was because the art of writing was not sufficiently advanced, or sufficiently known, in those early times to allow such written records to be prepared. But they purport to be compilations of that very age. This conviction of Renan's, therefore, was damaging to the Old Testament in two ways. First, this gives the impression to the reader of being a contemporary history, which, of course, is false; and, second, as the account was not compiled at the time of the occurrence, there is the possibility, and even the probability of error, through oral transmission and legendary exaggeration. But, after this conviction of Renan's has become the conviction of many others, who have accepted his *ipse dixit* without question, and it has done its evil work, what do we find? The conviction was utterly unfounded, and altogether a mistake. The discoveries of the last six years have shown that the art of writing was well understood and extensively used, not only before the time of the Judges, and of Joshua, and even of Moses, the writer of the very first book of the Bible; but long even before the times of Abraham, who lived nearly five hundred years before Moses began to write. Great numbers of documents, unearthed from tombs and ruined palaces in Egypt and Mesopotamia, prepared many centuries before the epoch of the Judges, are now collected in the libraries and museums of Britain and the continent.

Now, before we pass on, let us look at this exploded criticism, and learn the simple lesson which it ought to teach. On what ground did Renan form that conviction? Because he did not know the art of writing was so well understood and so generally used. Had he known the art of writing was so well understood and used, that would have been a rational ground for a conviction; that would have been an opposition of science, for science is just another word for knowledge. But, as a matter of fact, his ignorance was the ground of his conviction. Because he did not know books were common at that time, therefore he concluded these books could not have been written then. This opposition was actually the opposition of ignorance, and not of science; as the New Testament so severely, and yet so truly, calls it in one place, "the opposition of science, falsely so called." Because he was ignorant of a fact, therefore he denied a fact, and thousands of people accepted his denial, and repudiated the fact, because he was supposed to know so much. And if Renan were alive to-day he would be compelled to acknowledge his mistake, made through ignorance and unbelief. The lesson to be learned is this, "Science and not ignorance ought to be the source of criticism." The affirmation or denial should rest on

what is known, and not (as in this instance) on what is not known.

The natural outcome of a criticism such as Renan's constitutes a second grave objection to these early books of the Old Testament. The country of Palestine, therein described, is asserted to be almost wholly imaginary, and never to have existed in such state. The incidents narrated were only myths and legends, and transformations of a later age. Many of the persons referred to were quite fictitious, and of course as such to be rejected by all but the credulous. But what is the answer? A mound at Tel-el Amarna, in Egypt, has lately been explored, and has revealed a series of letters, 320 in number. They were written on clay tablets while they were soft, by means of a style or pen, shaped at the end something like a horse shoe nail. The tablets were then baked like bricks. These letters were sent to the King of Egypt from Babylonia and Arabia, and from various cities of Palestine. They were entirely of an official character, were of official business, and were preserved among the official archives. In fact they were part of the contents of the Egyptian Foreign Office, or the Colonial Secretary's Department. They are in Babylonian character, evidently the official language of that early period, the *lingua franca* of the nations. They are of very ancient date, some of them before the times of Abraham, and all of them more than 1200 years before the Christian era—that is, before Samuel, the last of the judges. Now Captain Conder, so well known for his long superintendence of the Palestine explorations, has recently published a work, in which he gives translations of no fewer than one hundred and twenty-six of these letters, all of which were written from Palestine to the King of Egypt, or other official persons. These official documents were executed just about the time of the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt, or of their exodus and conquest of Palestine. These settle definitely and for ever the question, that the Palestine of the tablets was identically the Palestine of the books of Moses and of Joshua. Many of the letters were written from cities named in the Bible history of that period. Mention is made of the nations and tribes referred to in the Bible. And some of the letters translated by Captain Conder, whose names, titles and actions are registered in early Bible history. In Joshua 10: 1 we read how Adoni-zedek, King of Jerusalem, sent unto Japhia, King of Lachish, and others, seeking to form a confederacy against Gibeon, the ally of the Israelites. In Joshua Hazor, unites the seven nations of the land of Canaan to fight with Joshua at the Waters of Merom. Is it not tablets found in Egypt, assigned by Egyptologists and of Joshua, are three, one from Adoni-zedek (King of Jerusalem), one from Japhia (King of Lachish), and one from Hazor (King of Hazor). Thus there is furnished in that the men named in the evidence of their autographs, very times to which they are assigned by the Bible, and at the very places in which they are located by the Bible. And is it not a significant and remarkable fact, Palestine to their suzerain, the King of Egypt, to furnish them aid against the Amurru? The "Amurru," to who are they? Why, the Hebrews; for most philo-

logists and linguists regard the Aperui as a foreign word for the Hebrew race. They were apparently invading the land at this very time, and the kings of Palestine, in fear, were writing down to Egypt for help. Where is now the criticism that the Palestine of Joshua was a fictitious one, and its kings were nothing but empty names? It is burst like a bubble.

In Joshua 17: 16 we read, "And the children of Joseph said, 'The hill is not enough for us; and all the Canaanites that dwell in the land of the valley have chariots of iron.'" These Ephraimites had outgrown their possession in the hill country, but they had not been able to drive out the inhabitants of Jezreel and Bethshean, because of their iron chariots. These chariots of iron have been an argument of the critics against the accuracy of the Book. This they say is an anachronism. It is evidence of composition at a much later date; for in the early period, during which Joshua is supposed to have lived, iron had not been brought into use. The people did not know how to smelt it or work it. The possession of iron chariots was out of the question. And the mention of them here proves the author of the book of Joshua to have lived long afterwards, in the age of iron and iron chariots, and in a moment of forgetfulness to have transferred the iron chariots of his own day to the times of Joshua. Just as an Adelaide boy, writing a description of the first years of the colony, might tell how Governor Hindmarsh, over fifty years ago, spoke from Glenelg, through the telephone, to Colonel Light, at the Government Offices in Victoria Square. Now for the anachronism. The site of Lachish was discovered by the conductors of the Palestine Exploration Fund. During their excavations they found evidence that several different races of inhabitants had consecutively occupied the same site, and each one had left a stratum of debris, in which the relics of their occupation were deposited. When the excavators reached the lowest stratum, they found the remains of the original city, the old Amorite town, which was standing in the days of Joshua. This was proved by the discovery of clay tablets of the same character and of the same age as those found at Tel-el-Amarna in Egypt, to which we were referring a few minutes ago. This was sufficient evidence that all the Amorite relics in this stratum were as ancient as the time of the Hebrew invasion. And here comes the revelation. In the monthly magazine for April, 1893, which contains the reports of the Palestine Exploration Fund, there was announced the discovery of "a smelting furnace for iron, attributed by Mr. Bliss (the superintendent for exploration) to 1400 B.C. Usher's chronology gives 1444 as the date of the Ephraimites' complaint about the chariots of iron." This is a fairly close approximation, surely close enough to silence any objection on the plea of anachronism. These criticisms remind me of the boomerang of the Australian aboriginal thrown by an unaccustomed hand. It hurtles through the air, and threatens to kill the game he hunts; but instead of that, it comes whizzing back and wounds the one who sent it on its way.

In 2 Chronicles 33: 11 it is written, "The Lord brought upon them (that is, Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem) the captains of the host of the King of Assyria, which took Manasseh among the thorns, and bound him with fetters, and carried him to Babylon." To this passage the Higher Critics took exception. They pointed out that the capital of Assyria was not Babylon, but Nineveh, and the deportation of Manasseh

and his people to Babylon by the captain of the host of the King of Assyria would be about as likely as the sending of prisoners of war captured by a French army to London, the metropolis of "Perfidious Albion." So the Bible was plainly wrong again. The compiler of the Chronicles was so ignorant, or so careless, as to confound Assyria and Babylon together, and put the capital of the one in place of the other. But "the potter who hath power over the clay" providentially preserved some of the clay tablets of this King of Assyria. It was Esarhaddon. His father had conquered the adjacent kingdom, and razed Babylon to the ground. But Esarhaddon rebuilt it, and in order to win the goodwill of its conquered people, spent one-half of his time there. He was, therefore, as likely to be at Babylon as at Nineveh, and it would be simply a question of the season of the year when Manasseh was forwarded to the king, whether he were sent to Nineveh or to Babylon. So again the edge of the critics' knife is blunted by a stone. The old Bible, which was wrong, turns out to be right after all. The critics, who knew so much, are proved to have known less than the truth, and probably less than the writer of the Chronicles, who seemed so lamentably ignorant. It strikes me these writers of the Bible are rather dangerous individuals to attack, and anyone who has a regard for his own reputation should be very careful how he accuses them of mistake or untruth; for these Babylonian bricks (which are lately so much in evidence) appear to be remarkable weapons of defence, and capable, not only of repelling charges, but of inflicting damaging wounds upon the foe.

Isaiah, in his 10th and 20th chapters, prophesied, during the reign of Hezekiah, an Assyrian invasion under Sargon the king. As an inspired seer, he described the enemy as approaching along the usual high road from the north-east and halting at Nob, only an hour's journey distant from Jerusalem, on the very day the oracle was uttered; while he declared that Jerusalem should fall into the hands of the enemy. But, said the critics, "This is all fancy; this is an ideal invasion; there never was a king of Assyria named Sargon, profane history is silent about him; the attack upon Palestine to which this refers was made by Sennacherib during the time of Hezekiah; and he entered the land, not from the north east, but from the south-west, and he besieged Jerusalem; and according to the Bible account given elsewhere, Jerusalem did not fall into his hands, but the angel of the Lord smote the army one night with a pestilence, the siege was raised, and the invader turned back to his own country. The prophet was simply lying a kite. There cannot be found in history anything to which it will correspond." But once more the stones speak out and confound the critics. They show that ten years before the Sennacherib incident, another king of Assyria about whom the world was profoundly ignorant, Sargon by name, did enter Palestine, did enter by the north-east, and conquered the whole land. And thus "the ignorance that is in them" has again been demonstrated to the critics, and the falsehoods of the prophet, thinly veiled under the honeyed phrase of "an ideal campaign," are established as the simple truth of history and of God.

The prophet Jeremiah in his 46th chapter predicted a desperate conflict between Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and the king of Egypt. He described how the former would overrun the land of the Nile, and sing the burden of her chief cities. But, singularly

enough, nothing of all this was to be gathered from profane historians. And so the truth-loving critics jumped on the Bible again. They said: "We really cannot allow the occurrence of this campaign. Here is another sad instance of inspired men drawing upon their imagination and pouring pictures of wars which never were waged." Well, Nebuchadnezzar was both a great warrior and a magnificent builder. Numerous records of his building operations are extant. But only one little fragment referring to his wars has been unearthed. Yet is it not a providence? That little contains an allusion to his invasion of Egypt. It took place in the 37th year of his reign. It is moreover confirmed by the monumental hieroglyphics of Egypt, which show how he overran the whole of the northern portion of the land. And so once more the prophet of the Lord is vindicated, and the prophet of Higher Criticism is convicted of unbecoming haste in denying the records of holy writ, and attributing falsehood on no other ground than his own want of knowledge.

In the first verse of the first chapter of Daniel we read: "In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, King of Judah, came Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, unto Jerusalem, and besieged it, and the Lord gave Jehoiakim, King of Judah, in his hand." Now in the first verse of the 25th chapter of Jeremiah it is written: "The word that came to Jeremiah, concerning all the people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, King of Judah; the same was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon. Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, I will send and take all the families of the north, and I will send unto Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, my servant, and will bring them against this land and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about, and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years." And in accord with this we read in the 2nd verse of the 46th chapter of Jeremiah, "Of Egypt, concerning the army of Pharaoh Necho, King of Egypt, which was by the river Euphrates, in Carchemish, which Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, smote in the fourth year of Jehoiakim." Here is an apparent discrepancy. Daniel tells us Jehoiakim, in the third year of his reign, was given into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar; whereas Jeremiah, in the fourth year of his reign, threatens Jehoiakim with an invasion, and further affirms the defeat of the king of Egypt at Carchemish on his way down to Judah. It seems impossible that both can be right. If the king of Judah was taken prisoner in his third year by Nebuchadnezzar, then certainly Nebuchadnezzar was not coming up to fight with him in his fourth year; it seems as though one of the two historian prophets must be in error.

De Wette, one of the Higher Critics, makes a vigorous attack upon this very point. He writes: "It is obviously false that Jehoiakim was carried thither at that date (that is to Babylon); and the false statement in the first verse of the first chapter of Daniel renders the historical existence of Daniel exceedingly doubtful." The want of correspondence between these two passages is branded as falsehood, and this falsehood leads to the suggestion that no such person as Daniel ever lived. He was a myth, a creation of some inaccurate writer of a later day. The remark about the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, and Daniel says Jehoiakim was given into his hand in the third year of his reign. Therefore his capture was in the year before the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, or in other words, the king of Judah

was given into the hands of the king of Babylon, a year before he was king of Babylon, which of course is absurd.

Well, after De Wette and two or three of his friends have nailed Daniel's lies on the counter, what do we find? Daniel was perfectly correct, and so was Jeremiah, while De Wette was wrong. Yes, after asking us not only to disbelieve Daniel's statement, but to discredit the very existence, wipe him out of the actual world, and consign him to the limbo of fignments; after this the clay tablets prove De Wette to be at fault. The explanation of the disagreement between the two prophets is as simple as could be wished. The wonder is that nobody guessed it before it was revealed by the tablets.

Daniel wrote his book in Babylon, and wrote like a Babylonian; Jeremiah wrote in Jerusalem, and wrote as a Jew. The one computed after the Babylonian style, and the other after the Jewish, and their method of computation was quite different. For instance, among the Jews, if a king had ascended the throne in September, 1892, and reigned till December, 1892, that would be regarded as the first year of his reign; from January, 1893, to December, 1893, as his second year, and from January, 1894, as his third year. Hence, if he had died in March, 1894, he would have been spoken of as reigning three years, because he had been holding the sceptre during some portion of three separate years, although he had really sat on the throne only some eighteen months altogether. But among the Babylonians, if a king's accession had taken place in September, 1892, and he had lived till December, 1892, those three months, would not have been reckoned to him, but to his predecessor. The first year of his reign would be calculated from the first New Year's Day after his ascension, viz., January, 1893; from the next New Year's Day, January, 1894, the second year of his reign would commence. Should he die in March, 1894, two years would be imputed to him, though he had only worn the crown eighteen months; and should he survive till December, 1894, he would still only be credited with two years, whereas he had actually reigned two years and a quarter. From this it is plain, that the first year of a monarch's reign, according to Babylonian reckoning, would be the second according to the Jewish; and the third year of Jehoiakim, calculated by Babylonian methods, would be the fourth year of Jehoiakim, counted after the manner of the Jews. The third year of Jehoiakim, computed by Daniel in Babylon, would be the fourth year of Jehoiakim, computed by Jeremiah in Jerusalem. And so the two prophets are shown to be in complete accord. Daniel is right, De Wette is wrong. We will still believe in Daniel as a fact in history, as a man beloved of God, and as a revealer of the future as well as a faithful recorder of the past.

Isaiah in chapter 21: 1-10 prophesied of the fall of the Babylonian Empire, and sang its doom in some of his most impassioned utterances. But here again he was set upon by the Higher Critics. They were not to be drawn away by his high-flown language. They loved truth, they did. And more, they were acquainted with history. Now what did he say? Why, that Babylon was to be given into the hands of Elam and Media. But it was not; it was given, as everybody knows, into the hands of Persia; for Cyrus the Persian came against the city and diverted the river, and went into the capital along the bed of the stream, and conquered it. They had their Herodotus; does not the Greek

historian tell us all about the siege, and give us the details? And after this, we are expected to believe Isaiah? Why, his prophecies were made up after the event transpired; so long after that the circumstances had been largely forgotten, and their inventor was exceedingly unfortunate in his manufacture of the predictions, for he mistook Elam and Media for Persia. But what say the tablets? Nahonidus, the King of Babylon at the time it was taken, calls him "Cyrus, the King of Elam," and says he overthrew the Maada, or barbarians (another name for Medians). Perhaps he was wrong, like Isaiah, and did not know Cyrus was a Persian. But if anyone in this world would know, it would surely be Cyrus himself. What does he say? On a cylinder made by himself, he calls himself "Cyrus, the King of Elam." "Without fighting or battle, Merodach (that is the God) caused him to enter into Babylon." This surely settles the matter. First he was king of ELAM, then he conquered Media—that is certainly known; and it is believed that after this he acquired Persia. So that, whereas he was in a sense king of Persia (as we find it written in Ezra 1: 2) and king of Media too, he writes himself down as "King of Elam." But where is Herodotus then? Well, very much at sea in comparison with Isaiah. For not only does Cyrus say "I am king of Elam," but he also says "I entered Babylon without fighting or battle." So the grand description of the siege of Babylon, by Herodotus, is a mistake, and Isaiah's forecast was correct. And now the critics find out that Herodotus must have inadvertently transferred the incidents of the capture of Babylon by Darius the Persian to the entry of Babylon by Cyrus the Elamite. Once more Isaiah stands acquitted of the charge of perjury.

The Old Testament repeatedly mentions a people called the Hittites. It represents them as a mighty power in the land of Canaan; as occupying an extensive territory, and as existing for many hundreds of years. Look at some of the references. Abraham bought the Cave of Machpelah for a burying-place from Ephron the Hittite in Hebron. Esau, to vex his father and mother, married wives of the children of Heth. When Joshua entered the promised land the Hittites, with their chariots of iron, opposed his progress, and were hopelessly defeated in the great battle by the Waters of Merom. Their soldiers of fortune led the hosts of David and Solomon. Both these kings formed matrimonial alliances with Hittite women, and Solomon himself was the son of David by a Hittite wife. One of the sources of revenue to King Solomon was his traffic with this people. He bought horses in mobs down in Egypt, and then sold them at an advance to the warlike Hittites. In the second Book of Kings is the record of the siege of Samaria by the Syrians. The Israelites were shut up in their capital, and were reduced to such straits through starvation as to compel unconditional surrender to the enemy. But according to Elisha's prophecy, "The Lord made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots and a noise of horses, even the noise of a great host, and they said one to another, 'Lo the king of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites and the kings of the Egyptians to come upon us;' Wherefore they arose and fled in the twilight, and left their tents and their horses, and their asses, even the camp as it was, and died for their life." According to Biblical accounts then, there existed a Hittite empire from the days of Abraham until at least the captivity of Israel. Now

the time of Abraham, according to Bishop Usher's chronology, was about 1900 years before Christ, and the captivity into Assyria and Babylonia 850 before Christ; so that the Hittites were a prominent and powerful people for more than a thousand years.

But here is a strange circumstance, classical history is almost absolutely silent regarding them. Their very existence tested upon the testimony of the Bible. How is it possible, it has been asked, for a mighty nation, such as this book represents these Hittites to have been for more than ten centuries, to have dropped completely out of history, so as to leave scarcely their name remaining? The answer of the Higher Critics has been: "It is not possible; it is not conceivable; the Hittites were an imaginary people." The references to them in the Bible have been impeached as untrue, and the veracity of the word of God. For instance, in 1857 Prof. F. W. Newman, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, in his "History of the Hebrew Monarchy," speaks of the Bible references to the Hittites as "unhistorical," and as "not exhibiting the writer's acquaintance with the times in a very favorable light;" while T. K. Cheyne, Fellow of the same College, writing on the Hittites, in the new edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, treats the Bible statements regarding the Hittites as unhistorical and unworthy of credence. And so our dear old friend the Bible lay for years under the suspicion and accusation of falsehood; for nobody would believe there ever had been a great Hittite nation except those prejudiced and unscientific people, who just believe whatever the Bible says.

Then the hieroglyphics of Egypt began to yield up their secrets and the cuneiform inscriptions of Assyria; and marvelously strange, there began to emerge from the oblivion of centuries, the nation of the Hittites. No petty tribe, but a potent empire of warriors, in constant conflict with the great monarchies of their borders. Assyria had to hurl the whole force of her kingdom upon them in campaign after campaign so as to hold her own; and even the great Rameses of Egypt was willing to make a treaty of peace with the "Great King of the Hittites," and to cement the union by marrying a Hittite princess. And the evidence is very strong that the Shepherd Kings of Egypt, who conquered the country and upheld their dynasty for a long period, were no other than the self-same Hittites. Now the Hittites, thus disinterred after a burial of two thousand five hundred years have been found, in almost every detail, to correspond with the Hittites of the Bible. Nor is it uninteresting to note how the Grand Old Man, the many-sided Gladstone, has made his contribution to the vindication of the Bible, adding one more gun to the battery upon the Impregnable Rock of Scripture. His intimate knowledge of Homer supplied the following quotation from the *Odyssey* as translated by Pope:—

"The time would fail, should I, in order, tell,
What loss were vanquished and what numbers fell,
How, lost through love, Euryalus was slain,
And found how bold his bold Cæcæan train.
To Troy no hero came of rasher line,
Or, if of nobler, Memnon it was thine."

In regard to which quotation Gladstone remarks, "The manner of the mention in Homer is completely in accord with—the idea of—the greatness of the Hittites, 1st Because the slaughter of their chief seems to be the crowning exploit that had been performed by the son of Achilles, 'I will not,' says Odusæus, 'name all that he slew, but only the hero Euryalus;' and because

the Keteioi (the Hittites) are named without epithet, description or indication, which accords with their being a famous and well-known race." The Kheta of the Egyptians, the Khatti of the Assyrians, the Keteioi of Homer, and the Hittites of the Bible are one people, and the book becomes a reliable, if not a supreme authority.

Now let us glance at our criticisms again, and see how they bear the light of these recent discoveries. Prof. F. W. Newman says of the narrative I have extracted from the Book of Kings, "The unhistorical tone is too manifest to allow an easy belief in it." He thinks "there was a real event at bottom," for Xenophon in his *Anabasis* speaks of dangerous night panics in the Greek and Persian hosts, and, therefore, the Syrian army may have fled in a sudden panic. "But," says he, "the particular ground of alarm attributed to them does not exhibit the writer's acquaintance with the times in a very favorable light. No Hittite kings can have compared in power with the king of Judah, the near and real ally, who is not named at all. Nor is there a single mark of acquaintance with contemporaneous history." Looked at from this side of the hieroglyphics, is not the criticism enough to make one laugh outright? He casts discredit on the incident because he thinks the Hittites were too insignificant to have caused alarm to the Syrian hosts. But what light do the Assyrian inscriptions throw on this particular point? According to Prof. Sayce's chronology, the tablets show that at this self-same time the Hittites were a mighty people, spread over the north of Syria from Carlemish, their capital on the Euphrates, to Lebanon. They had numerous chieftains or kings, who ruled over independent districts, and were distinguished among the nations for "their swift chariots, their horses, and their engines of war." We are thus led to the conclusion that the sacred writer was thoroughly acquainted with the times in which he wrote, and with the facts which he narrated, and that it is Prof. Newman's acquaintance with the times of which he wrote that does not appear in a very favorable light. Here again is a choice morsel for the critic. T. K. Cheyne, referring to the Bible statements regarding the Hittites, declares they cannot be taken as of equal authority with Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions. Very well; then let these sit in judgment. According to the Bible, the Hittites were a power in the land 1900 B.C. Now they appear for the first time in Assyrian inscriptions on the tablets of Sargon I. of Agané, placed by Prof. Sayce at what date? 1900 B.C. Is not that a strange coincidence? Again, the Bible tells of the Syrians flying in panic at the fancied noise of the chariots of the Hittites in B.C. 890. In the Assyrian inscriptions they are mentioned for the last time on the tablets of another Sargon, B.C. 717. If the tablets of the two Sargons are correct in these instances, then the books of Genesis and Kings are correct, for they are in perfect accord. If the Assyrian tablets are historical, then these books are historical. The eminent higher critic appealed from the Bible to the inscriptions of Egypt and Assyria, and the stones with their records have established the Bible, and fallen upon his criticisms, and ground them to powder.

And now I must draw my paper to a close. We have recorded quite a number of "Mistakes and leadings" have closely studied this book. They have put their finger down upon one verse after another, and said "Here is a

mistake" and "This is false." But further knowledge has confuted their criticisms, and established the truth of the Bible in those very instances. Such objections have, manifestly, had their origin in the ignorance of learned men. Had they known more, or had they known their own ignorance, they would not have laid such charges, and would not have made such mistakes.

But all their criticisms have not been cleared up; not by any means. It is hard for some people to learn wisdom. They have put their finger down on many other places, and are still repeating the formula, "Here is a mistake" and "This is false."

But what should be our attitude towards them and what the spirit of our mind towards the Bible? We should observe the same attitude in regards to the Science of History, as was displayed in respect to the physical sciences, in a paper now lodged in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, which was drawn up by the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1865. It was signed by 617 members, the majority of whom were at the time among the highest scientists in the world. "We believe it is the duty of every scientific student to investigate nature for the purpose of elucidating truth, and if he finds that some of his results appear to be in contradiction to the written word (God's word in the Holy Scriptures) or rather to his own interpretation of it, which may be erroneous, he should not presumptuously affirm that his own conclusions must be right and the statements of scripture wrong. Rather leave the two side by side, till it shall please God to allow us to see the manner in which they may be reconciled; and instead of insisting upon the seeming difference between science and the scriptures, it would be as well to rest in faith upon the points in which they agree." So with us having an implicit faith in the divine origin and complete accuracy of Bible history, we should be pleased with every addition to contemporaneous history from profane sources, Egyptian, Palestinian, Mycenic, Assyrian, Cilician, Babylonian, feeling assured that such added information—as far as it may be true—will only serve to confirm the sacred narrative. To what an unexpected extent this has already occurred it would take too long to show, and there are strong reasons for believing such corroboration will reach a far higher degree in the near future so as to establish the truth of this ancient volume beyond the possibility of adverse criticism. We may anticipate that further explorations into the realm of fact and truth will only support the testimony of holy writ, and demolish every engine of attack brought into position against it.

But in the present state of partial knowledge about those early times we ought not to accept every impeachment of the Bible by students of oriental history. They know very much, and with a wonderful industry and acuteness have acquired a vast amount of knowledge. But there is a vaster amount for them still to gain, and it is what they do not know which is liable to lead them into error. Our paper has taught us how profoundly wrong many of these profound objections have proved, and how puerile may be the studied opposition of men of eminence. What the criticisms of the past have been, such we may judge those of the present are, and such we may imagine those of the future will be. Our experience in recent years of exploration, excavation and decipherment furnishes a reasonable prospect that a continuation of the same research will only serve to overturn all remaining

Australasian Christian Standard

MARCH 14TH, 1895.

CHURCH FINANCE.

:—:—:—

A REPLY TO BRO. J. E. LAING.

F. G. DUNN.

The opening paragraph of Bro. Laing's reply betrays an undue anxiety to place me in the wrong, and discredit my remarks in regard to the teaching of scripture regarding giving and receiving. I am said to have made an inexcusable mistake in speaking of money as "the root of all evil." Common fairness demanded that any criticism should have taken into account the setting in which the words are found. The sense in which I use the words is clearly shown. Money is associated with nearly all that is evil, hence I say, "It is wonderful how the New Testament removes the idea of money from all that is sordid and mean; under the genius of Christianity it ceases to be a 'root of all evil,' and becomes instead a source of infinite good." Following the example of Bro. Laing, I might retort in the language of my critic, "At the very outset" Bro. Laing "makes a most surprising mistake, inexcusable in one who has studied the money question." I refer to his saying that I said that money was "the root of all evil," when I clearly stated that it was a "root of all evil." I might continue, in the words of Bro. Laing, "Such a mistake at the outset cannot but make readers suspect that it will not be the only one." J.E.L.'s criticism was uncalled for when it is borne in mind that I said "that money had become the symbol of the world's selfishness, and selfishness is the root of all sin."

CHRIST'S TEACHING ON THE USE OF MONEY.

What is said under this head meets with Bro. Laing's approval, but in his opinion requires amplification in so far as the words "it is required of a man according to what he hath" are concerned. This is a quotation occurring in an extract taken from the *Expositor*, and is a comment on the Saviour's words in reference to the action of the widow in casting her two mites into the treasury of the temple. Bro. Laing is not certain whether the writer of this comment had Christians in his mind, but if he had, his language is misleading.

"If he meant men in general," continues Bro. Laing, "then the whole question is yielded, for if all men are to give, there must be some to receive or take charge of the contributions, and if the church is asked to undertake that duty, it can have no ground for refusing."

The number of "ifs" about this precious bit of reasoning is somewhat surprising. I don't know that it matters much whether the writer had Christians in his mind or not when he wrote these words, but as a

matter of fact it is evident from the context that he had, for after referring to various forms of giving and alluding to the man who refrains, he asks, "How dwelleth the love of God in him?" So it is clear from this that the whole question is not yielded—just yet.

THE FELLOWSHIP (ACTS 2: 42).

My pamphlet does not assert that Acts 2: 42 describes "a meeting for worship," consequently I am not concerned just now, with anything that Bro. Laing may say on that point. Nevertheless I hold that while it does not describe a fixed order of worship, it gives some of the principal items connected therewith. He holds that it describes "the Christian life," but he does not say whether he means the Christian life in the church or out of it or both, so we will let that pass until we are quite certain what he wishes us to understand.

My critic goes on to say: "The fellowship could not well refer to the weekly contributions, etc." Why not these as well as any other kind of collection? Had they no previous training in that direction? Was the synagogue form of worship transplanted in the Christian Church, and the weekly contribution common to the synagogue left out of it? Does not the mention of the "first day of the week" in connection with the special contributions for the poor saints at Jerusalem indicate a previous custom of weekly contributions, or are we to suppose that after "laying by" "at home" their money stopped there? Would they not bring it to the church on the "first day of the week" as we do now as the most convenient and appropriate time, or was Paul to go round all the houses of the saints and do the very thing he wanted to avoid, viz., waste time in taking up the collection when he came? Does not the fact that Justin Martyr, writing in the year 140 (in giving the first full description of meetings for worship on the Lord's day that we meet with after apostolic days), in referring to the collection as a part of that worship, indicate a practice that had been established for some time? and further does not his description strike the impartial observer as a striking exposition of Acts 2: 42? With these things before us I think it is high time some of our brethren put a little common sense and less bias into their inductions from teachings of the holy scriptures.

In reference to the word *koinonia*, Bro. Laing thinks that Bloomfield's interpretation is the most probable.

"Well, Bloomfield says that Acts 2: 42 contains an instance of '*hrec.kai*'—that the fellowship (or communion) are two phrases presenting the one compound idea of 'the communion in the breaking of bread.'"

But Bro. Laing has the candour to add

"There must be always more or less doubt as to whether any alleged case of '*hrec.kai*' is really so," etc.

Precisely so. Then Bro. Laing's most "probable" interpretation rests upon what he admits to be a doubtful case, and consequently should be dismissed by

all intelligent men and women. So far as I am concerned, it is immaterial to me whether Hebrews 13 and 16 contains an instance of *hendiadys* or not; my argument is not built upon the *hendiadys*, but upon the fact that the word *κοινωνία* is there and refers to alms giving. Nevertheless I think the author I quoted can make out a fair case for his *hendiadys*, whereas I am of opinion that the *hendiadys* utterly fails, as I will now show. The literal rendering of Acts 2: 42 is as follows:—"Moreover, they were firmly adhering to the teaching of the apostles and to the fellowship, to the breaking of the loaf and to the prayers." Now if "the fellowship" is to be joined to anything in this verse, the conjunction "and" joins it to the "apostles' teaching;" and so it does, but how? The Cambridge Greek Testament says:—"Κοινωνία: that communion, or holding all things common, of which a more full description is given in the following verses, and which would bind them most closely into one society." The omission of the conjunction after *κοινωνία* makes a division between the educational and social duties on the one hand, and the strictly devotional on the other." It follows, therefore, that any rendering which seeks to join "the fellowship" to "the breaking of the bread," can only do so by violating the usual laws of interpretation.

But he finds "in 1 Cor. 10: 16 language which goes far to prove that the two expressions convey one compound idea."

"The bread which we break is it not a communion (*κοινωνία*) of the body of Christ?"

The absurdity of this idea will be at once seen when the context is borne in mind. The word *κοινωνία* is introduced to show that they could not be eating the bread and drinking the cup of the Lord and also partaking of the table of demons. Paul would not have them have "communion with demons." Is the "communion of demons" another case of *hendiadys*? No instance can be found in the New Testament in which the words "the fellowship" or "the communion" are used in a technical sense as applying to the Lord's Supper. The technical phrase for the Lord's Supper in New Testament times and for long after was "the breaking of bread."

Hro. Laing objects to my finding an explanation of "the fellowship" in verses 44, 45. An "unbiased student of history" would not do so he asserts. If that is so, what sort of student is Hro. Laing? Writing in the *Standard* of February, 1893, he says:

"The expression, *the prayers*, has a specific appearance and the context seems to point out that the regular temple prayers are those referred to."

We read that with one dissent they continued daily in the temple; and that Peter and John went up together at the hour of prayer."

Here he finds an explanation of "the prayers" in the immediate context, but declines to do so in the matter of "the fellowship," and why, simply because it does not suit his present purpose.

In February, 1893, Hro. Laing could speak of "the fellowship," as referring to a work that was carried on all the week round, at first by a somewhat haphazard fashion; it means more systematically by the chosen deacons; but afterwards, however," he continues, "to say that this exhausts the meaning of *κοινωνία* in this verse."

In February, 1895, he has changed his mind and thinks it means fellowship in "the breaking of bread" only.

He can find "the prayers" specific because of the definite article, but when it comes to "the fellowship"

the definite article becomes a very paltry thing. To show how feeble a thing it is he tells us that

"In 1 Cor. 13 for example the article frequently appears before *αγάπη* (love), but cannot appear in a good English translation."

But Bro. Laing ought to know that while in this connection "the love" would not be good English it would be good Greek, and that the definite article was meant to have force in the mind of Paul when he was writing. Anyhow in a matter of this sort I prefer Prof. Tucker to Bro. Laing as an authority.

I must confess I do not understand the aversion shown by some of our brethren to associating the idea of money or its equivalent with "the fellowship" of Acts 2: 42. That there is on the part of some a bias against it, I am quite certain. It is possible that they fight against it because the admission would tell too strongly against their latitudinarian tendencies. In doing so they seem to ignore the fact that there are other passages which connect "the fellowship" in a technical sense with money—passages from the force of which there is no escaping; so that even if they could explain away Acts 2: 42, they are confronted with others which no amount of ingenuity can twist from their plain and evident meaning.

There is nothing in the history of the church of the first and second centuries so striking and so prominent as the boundless charity of its members. "They were men of enlarged philanthropy. Their hearts not only burned with fervent charity one toward another, but swelled with the wide wish of benevolence towards all men." Witnessing their deeds of kindness towards each other, the heathen exclaimed, "See how these Christians love each other." Christly love was expressed in deeds of benevolence which did not stop to count the cost. Never has the great law of love one towards another, which Christ gave as a "new commandment," been more exemplified than in the earliest periods of the church. By its grand sympathetic liberality it manifested in the highest degree "the exceeding grace of God" that was in them. And what I ask, was more fitting than that which was the visible expression of their fellowship with God, should be known amongst them in a technical sense as "the fellowship?" For my part I know of no reason except blind prejudice.

"GIVING" ONE OF THE GRACES.

"It is quite true," says Bro. Laing, "that giving is one of the Christian graces, but it is also true that it is a Jewish and heathen grace as well."

Very well, who questioned it? But a heathen "grace" is not the same as a Jewish, nor is a Jewish the same as a Christian. Take, for instance, the chief of the graces—love. Practically Christianity had to take a new word to express its thought. The word rendered *love* is unknown, as its significance was unknown in classic literature, as its significance was unknown in classic literature. The usual word for love had sunk too low and become too impure to be used as expressive of the Christian grace. "This word (the Christian word) has the unique honour of being the only substantive noting explanation or limitation, of God himself; for God is love." Our own word "love" is the best we have to convey the thought of the inspired writer, but it has with us also lower associations from which the Greek word is free. And it is this love entering into giving which makes the latter a distinctively Christian grace. And no offering unless accompanied with a love akin to

this is of any worth. "And if I bestow my goods upon the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing."

I think it would be well if Bro. Laing took some lessons in logic before he talked about the logic of other people. He asserts that

"Being a Jew or a heathen is no excuse for being graceless, though the logic of some leads to that conclusion. They think that if a man is not a Christian he is not only excused from practising any virtue, but is virtually prohibited from doing so."

A sweeping assertion of this sort does not reflect much credit on Bro. Laing. If there are any Christians who hold these views we have not heard of them.

It is quite true that man has a duty to perform to his fellowman irrespective of religion and nationality. The "barbarians" of Melita recognised this great truth when Paul was shipwrecked there. The sailors, soldiers and prisoners, including Paul, were treated with great kindness by these people. Many men who practically deny the existence of God, seek to do their duty towards their neighbors. The *worldly* moral man may do moral acts, but in the nature of things he cannot do acts of piety. Man may do things for man that he cannot do for God. Man may give and take on the ground of a common humanity without respect to character. In the same way God causes the sun to shine upon the evil and the good so far as the every day events of life are concerned, but when we leave the natural and enter the spiritual there is a difference. All that God has to offer the sinner is pardon upon certain conditions, and consequent upon it all other blessings, but from the rebellious and unpardoned sinner God can receive nothing, and all the "reward" he can expect, is to answer before God for his rebellious conduct.

It is asserted that

"The obligation of Christians to do good unto all men carries with it the right, and indeed the duty, on the part of all men to do good to them."

By what process of reasoning Bro. Laing arrives at this conclusion, I do not know. Its untenableness is at once seen when I state that the obligation cannot be the same in the two cases. In the case of a Christian, he is not only under obligation by a common humanity, but also by reason of his kinship to Christ. Whatever good a non-Christian does is not on account of this kinship to Christ, but on other grounds; hence the fallacy in Bro. Laing's statement.

As to the collection taken up for the poor saints of Jerusalem, I should judge from the fact that only churches and brethren are spoken of in connection with it, that we are not warranted in supposing that unconverted Jews and Gentiles had anything to do with it; and indeed the circumstances of the case, together with Paul's language, strongly supports this view. As to whether Paul *would* have taken money from the unconverted for this purpose is another question, and one that I am not in a position to answer.

"It is quite common," says Bro. Laing, "for us to receive from all and sundry contributions for social and humanitarian objects, and this is a step in the right direction. . . . Of all unscriptural practices, certainly that of having two classes of collections—one confined to saints, the other open to all—is the most glaring."

If Bro. Laing can show me that separate collections taken up from all and sundry for humanitarian purposes are unscriptural, I am quite prepared to abandon such collections. In that case we should be compelled to have our collections confined to the saints, and from the fund so collected give for humanitarian objects. Some of our brethren, I believe, hold this view; but in my

opinion it is quite legitimate to make a distinction between collections which are intended to be used and administered by the church only, and those taken up for purely humanitarian objects, but which the church does not administer. In the first case if we take money from worldlings, we lead them to suppose that they have a right to make such offerings to God, when as a matter of fact they have no such right. In the second case they are under no such delusion, as what they give is known to be for the service of man and because of a common brotherhood.

GIVING A SACRIFICE.

It may be true that

"All Jews, Mohammedans and heathens are not to blame for not being Christians."

Such as have not heard of Christ cannot be expected to believe in Him. They are in God's hands and we know that the Judge of all the earth will do right. However, when the said persons come within the sound of the gospel there is no more excuse for them. It is our duty to preach Christ to them, and to make them feel that their position outside of Christ is one of danger. It is our duty to tell them that God commands them to repent, and not to delude them with the idea that they may continue in a state of rebellion and offer acceptable sacrifices unto God.

Bro. Laing directs attention to what he calls a "remarkable sentence"—"Both Jew and Gentile are to leave their old religions behind them. Whatever tolerance might have been manifested in the earlier transition stage is finally abandoned." That the Jewish Christians had a strong leaning towards their old religion is a well known fact, and one that Bro. Laing has used whenever it suited his purpose. It is an equally well known fact that the writer to the Hebrews throughout his epistle condemns this weakness and shows its sinfulness, and finally tells them to go outside the camp of Judaism and take their stand with Jesus. I say again that Christianity is not tolerant of half-service or lukewarmness. It was the lukewarmness of the Laodicean Church which caused Christ to say "I will spue thee out of My mouth."

Yes, Bro. Laing we will go back to Jerusalem (and do our best to make you keep us company), but in going back we will take the utterances of inspired apostles as our guide and not the faulty exposition of some weak kneed disciples.

TAKING NOTHING FROM THE GENTILES (3 JOHN 7).

In dealing with this passage we have not gone on the assumption that "the persons referred to were infallible even in their actions." We cited it as an approved example of what evangelists did in apostolic days, because their conduct met with the approbation of an inspired apostle. On the assumption that the rendering in the revised version is correct, Bro. Laing thinks they may have done wrong in not taking anything from the Gentiles. It is a strange thing that the same idea did not occur to the Apostle John, and that he gave them no instructions to alter their conduct in the future.

I think most commentators are of opinion that when alluding to his refusal to take assistance from the Corinthians, Paul said, "Forgive me this wrong," he was indulging in a little gentle satire. However, Bro. Laing says that Paul's error is not on a par with that recorded in 3 John, and that being so why did he in-

roduce irrelevant matter -- but Bro. Laing is nothing if he is not irrelevant.

But Bro. Laing thinks the translation is wrong and that it should read "Because that for the sake of the Name they came forth empty handed from the Gentiles." "The translators," he says, "have mistaken the standpoint." Now is it not possible that the translators were right and "J. E. L." wrong? In order to get at "J. E. L.'s" position two things have to be assumed: 1st that these strangers were new converts, and 2nd that they were compelled to leave their homes penniless. Now these two assumptions are not warranted by the text, and consequently they have no weight. What is the translators' standpoint? It is that the strangers were evangelists who went forth preaching the gospel, and for the sake of the Name took nothing from those to whom they preached. That they were preachers of the word may be seen from verse 8: "We, therefore, ought to welcome such, that we may be fellow-workers with the truth." As for the rendering in the Revised Version that is correct enough, as may be seen by the following comment from the Cambridge Greek Testament: "Some expositors render 'driven out by the heathen penniless.' But wight forth is too gentle a word to mean this; and the negative *meden* seems to imply that it was their determination not to accept anything, not merely that as a matter of fact they received nothing." In favour of Bro. Laing's rendering, verse 5 is brought into requisition. "The probability that this is the true translation," he says, "is strengthened by the language of verse 5, which speaks of them as brethren and strangers without." If this is all the strengthening he can give to his rendering, it is in a very poor case indeed. Verse 5 strengthens nothing except that they were "brethren and strangers;" strangers meaning foreigners or Gentiles.

SECOND CENTURY GIVING.

In my pamphlet after showing what was the practice of the church concerning giving and receiving in the first century I go on to show that the same practice was continued in the second. As might be expected Bro. Laing has some irrelevant remarks to make just here, these I pass as not calling for serious attention. The action of the church in refusing money made in unlawful occupations and receiving gifts only from Christians in communion, are characterized as

"Hugian regulations," and he wonders "what they thought of the Saviour's receiving the offering of precious ointment from the woman who was a sinner, and of Paul allowing himself to be loaded with gifts from the barbarians of Malta."

I don't know what they thought about these things, but no doubt they knew that the Saviour said to the woman, "Thy faith hath saved thee, go in peace," and as far as the "barbarians" are concerned they perhaps thought their kindness was an evidence of "the unity of the human race," and that man has a duty to perform towards his fellow independent of the religious aspect of the question.

Says Bro. Laing:

"In framing their human regulations for the refusal of offerings, the second century people seem to have quite forgotten what Christ said about the altar sanctifying the gift."

I would amend this and make it read that in carrying out the teaching of Christ and His apostles they showed that they understood very much better than Bro. Laing does what Christ meant by the "altar sanctifying the gift," and were no doubt quite familiar with Malachi

1: 6,8 which reads: "And ye say; wherein have we despised thy name? Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar, and ye say wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say the table of the Lord is contemptible. And when ye offer the blind for sacrifice, it is no evil!" From this they would understand that the altar only sanctifieth the gift when a true worshipper offered a suitable sacrifice. They would moreover remember that Christ said to the woman of Samaria: "But the hour cometh and now is when the true worshipper shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for such doth the Father seek to be His worshippers. God is a Spirit; and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and truth." When Bro. Laing has grasped the meaning of this great truth he will be in a better position to deal with the "money question."

The case of the rich young man is brought forward, and we are told that

"The second century people must have thought that the Saviour made a great mistake in telling him to sell his property and give to the poor before commencing to follow him."

No, but if they had known Bro. Laing, they would probably have told him that they were not in the habit of thinking that Jesus made mistakes, they left that for nineteenth century disciples to do; that as the rich man had kept the commandments of that dispensation, but failed in one essential thing, it was right and proper for Jesus to point out to him the one thing needful to make his life perfect. And that if a rich young man had come to them and said

"Here are the proceeds of my property which I have sold in accordance with Christ's command to one circumstantially like me who interviewed him when on earth. Use the money as you think best. I am determined to become a follower of Christ."

the probabilities are that they would have baptised him straight away and taken his money with thanks.

But now I have something to say about this rich young man which "J. E. L." may not like. He has tried to make the practice of the church in the second century appear contemptible. But now let us see how "J. E. L.'s" style of reasoning affects Christ's himself. The case stands this way: 1st. The church of the second century is set up as an object of scorn, because "J. E. L." supposes it would not have taken the young man's money until he was in communion with it. 2nd Christ would not receive this young man as a follower until he had sold all his possessions and given the proceeds to the poor. Which, I ask, seems the harsher? To refuse the man's money or to refuse himself? Is "J. E. L." blind that he cannot see that by his foolish statements he is impeaching Christ Himself. Was not this young man a "learner," may more, was he not an advanced pupil? According to "J. E. L.'s" style of reasoning, Christ was wrong in allowing him to go away. He should have said, "Yes come with me and learn the way of the Lord more perfectly." This young man, according to his own statement, which was not disputed by Christ, loved God and his neighbour. Why did not Christ allow him to follow Him without making such a hard condition? Was Christ Pharisaic? Was He one that fenced Himself off, saying, Stand back, for I am holier than thou? Unquestionably He was, if all that "J. E. L." has said is true. Bro. Laing will have to change his position, or else leave himself open to the charge of having impeached Christ.

MATT. 10: 41, 42.

The argument on this passage largely turns on the meaning of the expression "in the name of a disciple," but not "entirely," as "J.E.L." asserts. The context has something to do with it as well. I must object to having assumptions made from things I did not say, and evidently done for the purpose of making a point. What I did say was "in the name of a disciple," meant that what is done is done for the love of Christ. And the words "in the name of a prophet" meant "for the love of Christ whose prophet he is," consequently it does not follow "that he who does anything for a prophet in the name of a prophet, must himself be a prophet."

Bro. Laing has not given such proof of exegetical ability as would lead me to adopt his interpretation as against Dean Alford's. I will, therefore, still hold "in the name of" is equivalent to "love for Christ." And that I am right in this view I will now proceed to show.

The verses referred to (Matt. 10: 41, 42) are the concluding words of our Lord's instructions to the Twelve, prior to their starting on their mission of proclaiming "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," and are worthy of being considered in that connection. The mission of the Twelve is frequently used as an argument against what is called "close contribution," but properly understood it is not so. It may be noticed in passing that those who use it in support of "liberal" views betray no anxiety to carry out the instructions given to the apostles in a literal and practical way, seeing that we do not hear of them starting out on preaching tours, with neither gold, nor silver, nor brass, in their purses, but are generally careful to stipulate as to salary, &c., before commencing their work. But perhaps they want to do so in future, so I will wait further developments. Having called attention to this little matter, I will now get back to the main point.

First of all let us notice a very significant direction, viz., They were not to go into the way of the Gentiles, nor to enter into a city of the Samaritans, but to go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Their mission, therefore, was to their fellow-countrymen, the Jews. In the second place, when they entered into a city they were to enquire who in it is worthy and there abide. In other words they were to be the guests, not of any Jew, but of devout Jews. And no doubt there were many of these, like Simeon and Anna, waiting for the "consolation of Israel," to whom the message that "The kingdom of heaven is at hand" would be most welcome. From this it appears that the twelve went to their devout co-religionists and partook of their hospitality. For it must be borne in mind that Judaism was in force until the death of Christ, therefore the Twelve as devout Jews went to other devout Jews and became their guests. In doing so they carried out the instructions of their Divine Master. And, if we are minded to do so, we may become the guests of our fellow Christians when we start on a mission of preaching the gospel. The unfortunate part of the matter is that we do not care to embark on a mission of this kind in this way because it does not seem to promise any substantial pecuniary reward. Our Home Missionary Committee, seeing that it is short of funds, might try the experiment for next year, but I am afraid that it would not work.

It is further stated in reference to the Twelve and

those to whom they went, that "he that receiveth you receiveth me; and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." Here, as Dean Alford says, there is "not only receiving to house and board, but receiving in heart and life the message, of which the apostles were the bearers." This is better still, and we shall soon be able to understand about the "cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple." Turning back to verse 14 we read: "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, in the day of judgment, than for that city." Commenting on verse 14 Alford says: "A solemn act which might have two meanings. (1) As Luke 10: 11 expresses at more length: 'We take nothing of yours with us, we free ourselves from all contact and communion with you,' or (2) which sense probably lies beneath this and verse 13: 'We free ourselves from all participation in your condemnation; will have nothing in common with those who have rejected God's message.'" Consequently they were to take nothing from those "who would not receive them nor hear their words," and by parity of reasoning, any hospitality rendered and accepted—even "a cup of cold water," had its reward, only as it was given for the love to the Messiah, the near approach of whose kingdom the apostles preached. From the foregoing it will be evident to the discerning reader that Bro. Laing in using this portion of scripture to sustain his position, has taken "a stick to beat his own back."

RECONCILIATION BEFORE GIVING.

"J.E.L." after admitting that Christ's teaching on this subject is perfect, immediately proceeds to cavil about it. He says:

"It would be much better if he were reconciled to his brother, but to neglect to perform this duty does not excuse him from the performance of the other duty of giving."

According to this Christ ought to have said, "If thou rememberest that thou hast ought against thy brother it would be much better for you to be reconciled to him, but if you neglect to do so, it won't excuse you from offering your gift." What Christ said, however, was very different. It was imperative, "first be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift."

"But," says Bro. Laing, "it is worthy of note that the gift is to be left at the altar, not taken away and then be brought back again."

Yes, "worthy of note," but not in the way, Bro. Laing, wishes it to be, quite otherwise. It does not modify but intensifies. Stay the sacrifice, for God will not accept it unless the heart be free from anger. To offer it after this command was to add to the sin of anger, that of disobedience.

Again, my critic says:

"The inference from this teaching, viz., that man must be reconciled to God before giving, is quite unwarranted."

To sustain this assertion he introduces Cain upon the scene. "Cain's offerings were not accepted, yet he was not told to discontinue bringing them." But this is not strong enough, so Bro. Laing continues, "He was told that if he did well they would be accepted, but in any case they were to be brought." First he is negative, and then he is positive. It would be interesting to know which of the two statements I have italicized is to be taken, and where the authority for either is to be

found? Bro. Laing has said many weak things, but this I think caps them all. To continue bringing gifts and ignore the conditions on which they are to be brought is an act of defiance which aggravates the first offence. Has Bro. Laing never read, "Woe unto them, for they went in the way of Cain?"

Another specious piece of reasoning is introduced by "J.E.L.," when he says:

"If a son does not render to his parents the filial affection due to them, he is not therefore excused from the performance of other duties—the duty, for example, of supporting them in their old age." This shows the danger of confounding things that differ. "J.E.L." goes upon the assumption that the relationship existing between father and son is exactly the same as that which exists between God and man, whereas it is not. Sonship to God is obtained through Jesus Christ, and only through him in Him can we become reconciled to God. God is not dependent upon his children for support. The gifts they offer do not enrich Him, and He does not want them unless love is at the back of them. If earthly parents were not dependent, they would say "Take back your gifts until you can give your love with them." The failure to render filial affection is an act of wickedness both as regards God and man, and so far as God is concerned, we are told that "the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to Him," and I take it that it is our duty, so far as we are able, to prevent people doing abominable acts.

Again he says:

"The state does not excuse disabled members from paying taxes, and God does not excuse the most rebellious of Adam's race from offering sacrifices to him."

As I am not concerned with what the state does in this present argument, I will allow it to look after its own interests, and give my attention to the latter clause relating to offerings made to God. I feel deeply grieved that any brother could be found in our midst capable of making such a statement. Does Bro. Laing set himself against God? Has God not said: "When ye come to appear before me *who hath repaired this at year ends*, to trample my courts, bring no more vain oblations; increase is an abomination unto me; new moon and Sabbath, the calling of assemblies,—I cannot away with iniquity and the solemn meeting" (Isa. 1: 13). This single statement on the part of Bro. Laing is sufficient proof of his utter incapacity to deal with a question of this kind.

There now comes a statement that I am saved the trouble of answering, seeing that I intend to allow "J.E.L." the privilege of refuting himself. The statement is this:

"And if the church is asked to be treasurer and disburser of these offerings, she should only be too glad to see the part, realising that faithfulness in that which is least is likely to lead to faithfulness in that which is greatest."

Now, Bro. Laing wrote an article which appeared in the *A. C. Pioneer* (edited by Bro. Gore) of June, 1874, in which he defends my position in regard to 3 John 7. In this he says:

"We shall now consider the question of receiving money from the unworshipped for the cause of Christ from a different standpoint. We shall view it in the light of the fitness of things. After earnestly preaching the gospel to an audience, would it be fitting for the preacher to say, 'If you will not give yourselves to the Saviour, you help us to continue the preaching.' I am sure every preacher would scorn the thought of doing such a thing."

"But 'Investigator' will probably say, 'Oh, I would never think of begging the money in that way; but I think it is quite right and fitting to take it when offered.' Let me say here there is a step between *giving* and *begging*. When Christians resort to either it is to save their own pockets, and sparing their own pockets leads to leanness of soul, and also: 'It is never applied to Christians to distinguish them from other people.' When a person is lean in soul he is liable to catch any disease and be carried off. Suppose one of the audience was to say without being asked, 'Well I cannot decide to give myself to the Saviour, but here is some of my money,' what would be his motive? Certainly he cannot truly love the Saviour, or he would obey Him, and if he does not love Him, why does he give his money? It must be a sort of propitiatory sacrifice. Now, would it be right to encourage the idea that God can be propitiated without obedience? And if not, it cannot be right to take money from those who have not obeyed the gospel, for that would be fostering the idea.

"Would the Kehathites—the family in which the priesthood was seated, have accepted the proffered assistance of others to help them in attending to and bearing the ark? They would not. And it is fitting that the priests of God under the present dispensation should accept the proffered assistance of the enemies of Christ to bear the ark of the New Covenant? Most assuredly not."

Now, I quite admit the right of any brother to change his views after the lapse of years, providing he has obtained a greater insight into the truth, but has Bro. Laing given any evidence of that? Is his reasoning to-day as good as that of twenty years ago on this subject. Let the brethren judge between the two.

A CONTRAST.

My statement that "the contrast between the churches of the first and second centuries in respect to giving is very striking" does not meet with Bro. Laing's approval. Even a well recognised fact like this he must quibble about and seek to hide the issue by introducing matter foreign to the question. I was of opinion that anyone who knew anything about church history would admit without question that the early church was unparalleled in the matter of giving. Bro. Laing is, however, an exception and probably the only one that could be found. The outburst of Christly love which caused those early disciples to sell their possessions and place the proceeds in a common fund, appears to me to afford a rather striking contrast to the undue proportion of threepenny pieces we find in the collection boxes of the present day, but no doubt Bro. Laing can explain this away to his own satisfaction if not to anybody else's. Listen to what Lyman Coleman says: "Numerous instances remain on record of the boundless charity of early Christians, of which in this boasted age of Christian benevolence we have no parallel." And again: "We know many among ourselves," says Clement of Rome, "who have given themselves up to bonds in order that they might ransom others. Many, too, surrendered themselves to slavery, that, with the price they received for themselves, they might provide food for others." Surely Bro. Laing must think that those who will read his pamphlet are densely ignorant or he would not dare to write some of the things which I have drawn attention to. I cannot refrain from saying here that Bro. Laing is not the only one among our teachers who speak and write as if they regarded their audiences as capable of swallowing anything.

OUR PLEA.

Bro. Laing is "sorry to see this heading," and this is just what we should expect from a brother holding the views he does. We agree with him when he says:

"It was a noble thing to start our movement with a declaration to adopt and keep to the teaching and practice of the New Testament church."

and though some, like Bro. Laing for instance, seem to make "our plea" a dead letter, it is nevertheless "a phrase to be proud of."

At present, I have nothing to do with "the thousand and one points" that Bro. Laing speaks of, consequently I may leave the "one thousand" just now and attend strictly to the "one" before me. Had Bro. Laing done so he might have reduced the size of his pamphlet very considerably. Bro. Laing speaks of that part of "our plea" found in the words "being silent where scripture is silent." Without noticing his remarks about this phrase I would direct his attention to the other part which he does not mention, viz.: "Where the Bible speaks we speak." The subject we are discussing comes under the latter and not the former. The Bible is not silent on the question of giving and plainly indicates who are to give, consequently much that he says here is quite beside the mark. But it appears that Bro. Laing is a "truth seeker," and people like myself are "echoes." Consequently he says:

"Let us restore 'our plea' to its original signification, and be true to it by being truth seekers like the pioneers of the movement, and not simply their echoes."

I would remind Bro. Laing that there is such a thing as standing fast to the truth. That it is quite possible for men to grasp a principle and adhere to it. On the other hand it is equally possible under the mask of "truth seeking" to be groping in darkness, indeed there are quite a number of these kind of "truth seekers" about just now. And what are they doing? Are they letting the word of God reveal its truth to them? No, on the contrary they are trying to make the word of God say what they want it to say—and forsooth they call themselves "truth seekers."

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

I should have thought that Alexander Campbell's utterance on the money question was plain enough for any to understand, but I suppose it is a case of "none being so blind as those that don't want to see." I have nothing to do with what Campbell said on some other question. It is enough for me that in speaking of the subject under discussion, he said: "The apostles, prophets and evangelists named in the New Testament never solicited nor employed others to solicit any sort of support from those they sought to convert. Every principle of Christianity is adverse to such a proceeding."

THEORY AND PRACTICE.

Bro. Laing commends my remarks under this head to the careful perusal of the brethren, but he does not think that an overflowing treasury would "justify us in refusing the proffered donations of non-members, whether professing Christians or worldlings." Neither do I. My reasons for refusing to take from all and sundry are founded on quite other grounds. I simply think that an overflowing treasury would remove the temptation to set aside a Divine principle. Bro. Laing talks about failing to distinguish between professed Christians and worldlings. A statement which, if it applies to anyone, certainly applies to himself, for throughout his pamphlet he contends that professed Christians and worldlings are alike called upon to make offerings to God. But although he has been guilty of the offence he condemns, I should be sorry indeed to apply to him the words "vicious, intolerant and Pharisaical." I notice that the apostles of "liberty and

light" generally have a choice assortment of epithets at their disposal, for the benefit of those who disagree with them. Probably this may be regarded as indicating their notion of "liberty."

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

I have a very strong objection to placing Cornelius and Cain on the same level in the matter of giving. This "vicious" practice Bro. Laing persists in to the last. What possessed our brother to take Cain under his special care, I may surmise but certainly cannot understand. It is not often that an adversary furnishes a weapon for his own destruction, as he has done in this case; and although it is a pitiable spectacle, it has the advantage of saving his opponent some degree of trouble.

General principles, such as "He that hath pity on the poor lendeth to the Lord," must be understood in the light of others which render it necessary that any offering made to the Lord shall be a pure sacrifice, otherwise such portions of scripture as 1 Corinthians 13 are of very little value.

Attention is now directed to the following statement by Bro. Laing. He says:

"It will be noticed that the position taken up throughout is that the church is not at liberty to refuse any freewill offering. It may be argued that if it is a duty to give, it is a duty to solicit offerings so as to get the duty of giving attended to. But this by no means follows."

Twenty years ago, he could say "There is but a step between taking and begging," now he can see a very important distinction! He gives no satisfactory reasons for making this distinction, and so the cogency of the argument "that if it is a duty to give, it is a duty to solicit offerings so as to get that duty attended to" remains undisturbed. What he says by way of refutation, as a matter of fact accentuates the above argument. I think I may fairly retort in his own words, "Absurd doctrines are sure to lead to artful dodges."

We are told that

"The Israelites in the wilderness were a type of the Christian Church, and for this reason lessons are freely drawn from them."

True, in many respects they were. "Why not draw a lesson from Num. 15: 14." Certainly. As Bro. Laing will probably have noticed I have a great weakness for the context. Let us read: "And if a stranger sojourn with you, or whosoever be among you throughout your generations, and will offer an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto the Lord; as ye do so shall he do. For the assembly there shall be one statute and one ordinance for you and for the stranger that sojourneth with you, a statute for ever throughout your generations; as ye are so shall the stranger be before the Lord." From this I learn that: 1. The stranger believed in God; 2. That he desired to worship God by making an offering; 3. That it was to be of a sweet savor unto the Lord; 4. That he was subject to the one statute and one ordinance of the assembly. Now I could preach a very good sermon from this, but forbear.

But while I am quite willing to draw lessons from the worship of the Israelites, I am not willing to allow it to dominate the worship of the New Testament. This is the mistake that Bro. Laing and others of his school make. They take certain things in the old dispensation and endeavor to fasten their misconception of their meaning upon the Christian Church. Following the example of Pseudo-Baptists they seek to minimize

the force of New Testament teaching by a wrong application of the teaching of the Old. They are not even particular to be consistent in their error. When it suits their purpose they can talk about the law being "destroyed," but at other times they can conveniently forget what they previously said. Now Bro. Laing does not himself draw any lesson from Num. 15: 14, he leaves the lesson to be inferred by underlining the words "stranger" and "whosoever," and if we understand his meaning, he intends to convey the idea that the question of fitness is not involved. If this is his idea it is altogether erroneous. The context shows that these persons: 1. Reverenced God; 2. That they desired to worship Him; 3. That their offering was to be a sweet savor unto the Lord; and 4. That they were subject to the laws of the assembly. Fitness, therefore, was a prerequisite to this worship. Or again Bro. Laing may mean that as the status of persons were graded and their privileges likewise, therefore the same condition of things should obtain in the worship of the Christian Church. These grades were as follows: 1. The priesthood; 2. The homeborn; and 3. The stranger. The last named being divided into two classes, viz., the circumcised and the uncircumcised. One thing was demanded of all, viz., that they should reverence God. There was still another class who were not permitted to worship in the sanctuary at all, viz., the members of the seven Canaanitish nations. We presume Bro. Laing wishes to introduce this system of caste into the Christian Church, and that he forgets for the time being that the caste system is expressly forbidden. That in Christ Jesus "there can be neither Jew nor Greek (the Greek here is equivalent to "the stranger"), there

can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." In this glorious oneness we propose to abide and consequently have no intention of going back to Judaism.

I have to thank Bro. Laing for his suggestion about drawing lessons from the Israelites, because it reminds me of one he drew twenty years ago. It is so good that it will bear repetition.

"Would the Kohathites—the family in which the priesthood was vested—have accepted the proffered assistance of others to help them in attending to and bearing the ark? They would not. And is it fitting that the priests of God under the present dispensation should accept of the proffered assistance of the enemies of Christ to bear the ark of the New Covenant? Most assuredly not.

This is far better reasoning than you give us now, Bro. Laing. Now, while I have no objection to draw lessons from the Old Testament, I do not take it as law for those under the new dispensation. The old was imperfect, the new is perfect. In the old there were distinctions that do not obtain in the new; for *all* are priests unto God. It was not the "home-born" or the "stranger" but the "priest" who was a type of the Christian; consequently Bro. Laing's lesson from the Kohathites is the one which tells with the most force and precision in the present discussion.

This brings me to the conclusion of a very disagreeable task, and one I would rather have left alone. But the publicity which has been afforded Bro. Laing's pamphlet seemed to render it imperative that I should appear not only in defence of the principle enunciated in my pamphlet, but of principles which enter into the foundation upon which we take our stand as an independent organisation.



adverse references to Bible story, and to vindicate the reliability of its many authors. And with such an experience and such a prospect we should note all discrepancies between the sacred and the profane accounts, and allow the two to remain side by side until a reconciliation has been effected. We should not allow ourselves to be enticed to accept every allegation of fraud levelled against the Bible. It has repelled so many attacks upon its veracity, as to greatly strengthen our confidence in it. So many inaccuracies have become incontestable facts, that its final triumph, with the discomfiture of all who shall take up arms against it, should be a foregone conclusion with us. We are not called upon to repudiate the word of God at once directly a scientific man, from observed facts, frames a conclusion which is not in accordance with his interpretation of that word. His conclusion may easily be wrong, though his facts may be right enough; and his interpretation of the Bible statement may be erroneous, though the statement itself may be perfectly accurate. There ought to be humility enough in science to preclude presumption, and if there be not, there should be common-sense enough in us not to accord that presumption too great a reverence.

Let us give the Bible TIME, and not be in too great haste to abandon it. As Dr. Parker has said, "It has shed off a good many measles, and sloughed off a good deal of scarlet fever, and come up out of many a struggle." Just give the Bible time. We should not allow the antiquity of the documents in the Bible to diminish, in any way, the credibility of their authors; nor the fact that they compiled sacred history rather than profane. On the other hand, both circumstances should favor their credibility. The earlier they lived the more likely is their account of events which happened earlier still to be correct; for they drank of the stream nearer its source, and therefore had a purer draught. And surely, if a man is writing to inculcate morality and piety, truth and honesty, his endeavor to speak the truth will be quite as sincere as his who writes for amusement, for money, or for fame. If, in some point, Herodotus and Isaiah diverge, why should we conclude at once in favor of Herodotus and against Isaiah? Why should not Isaiah be right, and the

voluninous old Grecian astray? We have seen that where Herodotus *did* differ from Isaiah, there he differed from Nahonidos, and from Cyrus, and from the truth. And why should it not be the same on any other point, or with any other profane historian? I have not the slightest doubt, that if, in any other particular, the famous old Grecian and the Hebrew prophet are at variance, time will prove Isaiah to have spoken the truth to the uttermost.

The interests involved in the complete accuracy of the Bible are too lofty and too profound to permit of an easy resignation of our faith in its divine origin and its historic truth. Its influence over our social, moral and religious life is so potent when its truth is acknowledged and obeyed; and so potent for good, that we should defend it to the last till it can be defended no longer. Personally, I have an implicit confidence in its divine origin and in its practical inefficacy. I hail with pleasure every fresh consignment of tablets and inscriptions from the buried cities of the East; for I am strong in faith that they will serve to substantiate every item in the Hebrew records, and that each fresh discovery in oriental archaeology will corroborate them in every important particular, and produce, if possible, stronger faith in this marvellous and invaluable book. "All flesh is only grass, and all the glory of man but the flower of the grass; the grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away, but the word of the Lord endureth for ever."

Sisters' Page.

"Stand fast in the Lord"—Phil. 4:1

Communications for this "Page" should be addressed to Miss Hill, 21 Brandon street, Adelaide, not later than the 15th of each month.

IMPORTANT.

A special Sisters' meeting will (n.v.) be held Monday evening, March 25th, in Swanston street chapel, at 8 p.m., to arrange for Conference, catering, &c.

Will secretaries please note: All reports should be in hands of superintendents *not later than 2 1/2 p.m.*

Deeds Reports to be sent to Mrs. Pittman, Airie Avenue, Armadale.
Foreign Monetary Reports—Mrs. Maston, Bath street, Adelaide.

Temperance Reports—Mrs. W. C. Thurgood, Swanston street.

Hospital Visitation—Mrs. Frazer, 264 Brunswick street, Fitzroy.

Sisters' Prayer Meetings—Mrs. W. Forbes, Holden street, N. Fitzroy.

EXECUTIVE.

The usual monthly meeting of the Sisters' Executive was held on the 1st inst.

The programme for Conference was submitted and approved. The Home Mission report was more cheering, the deficit having been reduced to £67. The sum of £357 15s. 2d. has been collected since Conference, of which amount the Sisters have collected £114 8s.

The correspondence included a long letter from Sister Thompson, in which she gave us many interesting details of her work in India. She expresses very warm thanks for the toys, garments, &c., sent in the Christmas box.

One was reported having joined the Church at Collingwood, from the Sunday school.

The nomination of officers for the ensuing year was attended to and several questions of importance discussed. Next meeting of Executive, April 5th.

The Sister's Annual Conference will (n.v.) be held on Wednesday, April 10th, commencing at 2.30; evening at 7 o'clock. It is hoped every sister will make an effort to attend.

SUNDAY SCHOOL.

North Richmond has an average attendance of 90 scholars, and 11 teachers. The school is progressing favorably. The "Sunbeam" is distributed monthly and text tickets are given to the infants. The pictorial advance leaflets are distributed weekly. Paid another visit to Collingwood; found them in good working order; busy preparing for the annual examination. The attendance very good; also order.

M.H.

A LITTLE SERMON.

We may, if we choose, make the worst of one another. Everyone has his weak points; everyone has his faults; we may make the worst of these; we may fix our attention constantly upon these. But we may also make the best of one another. We may forgive even as we hope to be forgiven. We may put ourselves in the place of others, and ask what we should wish to be done to us, and thought of us, were we in that

place. By loving whatever is lovable in those around us love will flow back from them to us, and life will become a pleasure instead of a pain; and earth will become like heaven; and we shall become not unworthy followers of Him whose name is Love.—*Arthur P. Stanley.*

MRS. THURGOOD'S LETTER.

DEAR EXECUTIVE SISTERS.—

Well beloved in the Lord. A new year's greeting—"To walk worthily of the Lord into all pleasing, bearing fruit in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God" (Col. 1: 10, R.V.). What higher desire have we for the new year than to carry out the beautiful thought of this text! especially when we remember we are "strengthened and made powerful according to the might of his glory." How it should inspire us to braver effort, better plans, and stronger purposes for our Lord and Master. The old year is leaving the earth to-day enveloped in a mantle of purest white; all the smoke and soot of this busy city has disappeared—the beautiful snow has covered every defect; all is white, glistening, pure, in the radiant sunshine, but the air is very cold.

"It rains the noise; it bites the toes; It stings little children in the ear, And draws from their eyes the big round tear."

This has been a busy month with the children. As soon as our protracted services were over on the 10th, we had an entertainment with our Industrial School and kindergarten children—150 of them. This was very much enjoyed. After that came the Christmas exercises. We have 317 in the Sunday Schools, and we knew many old scholars would be coming in, so we decided to repeat the entertainment. Christmas night for the school, next night for parents and friends. We had the church building prettily decorated. A brother from the mountains sent us down eight bags of cedar and pine, and a fine Christmas tree. We made long ropes of the cedar and festooned them gracefully, also wreaths of holly leaves with a lovely gilt star. The prettiest sight of all was the well trained children of the infant class. Several of the friends say we ought to have it over again; it was so enjoyable and such a success. The week's work was not yet over, for on Saturday we gave our kindergartners a Christmas treat. It was to be a surprise. I wish you could have seen the faithful teachers who

were gathered in the chapel, bitterly cold as it was, to get the "feast" ready. We had two long tables with snowy table-cloths, and 50 plates on each table. Then a small table with about 28 plates for the wee ones. On each plate was a large slice of turkey and dressing, bread and butter, a piece of pie, three cookies and a piece of cake. Under each plate was a pretty paper napkin, and on each of the four corners we had candy, grapes, nuts, and a rosy apple. A paper bag by the side of each plate for them to "gather up the fragments" in. They were so surprised and delighted. The bitter cold day prevented the usual attendance, and we only had 100 children; but we sent a bag of goodies to the absentees. We also gave each one a souvenir book, and they were pleased beyond measure. A case of oranges promised came too late for the feast, but they will be distributed next Saturday.

How lovely it is to work with the children, to sow the seed of everlasting truth in their little hearts, and train their willing hands.

"Only an hour with the children,

Pleasantly, cheerfully given;

Yet seed was sown

In that hour alone,

Which would bring forth fruit for heaven."

You will be pleased to know we have organised a visiting committee among our C.A.W.M. Auxiliaries (or United Missionary Societies), very much after the plan of our Visiting Committee in the Executive in dear Australia, and we trust good work will be done. The *Missionary Tidings* very often desires a contribution from this busy pen. I must not forget to tell you that my Bible Class in the Sunday School of 21 ladies, old and young, gave us a handsome clock (black and gold) that sets off our mantle very much. It is very *striking* indeed, telling us with its sweet silvery tones to "redeem the time." We were most kind ways.

Dear Sisters, we are very busy and happy in our work here, and the Lord has prospered us. To Him be the honor and the glory. But in our very heart of hearts we ever long to be with our dear beloved workers in Australia's sunny land. In *God's good time!* May His fatherly blessing rest upon you all, and may this rest year be one of great joy to our dear colony. Ever the loving prayer of your sister worker,

ANTONETTE K. THURGOOD.

The Traveller.

MY TRIP TO MAORI LAND.

CHAS. WATT.

No. 2.

WE reached Lyttelton on the morning of Saturday, 3rd November; and in order to secure being in Dunedin by Lord's day, I booked through the remainder of the journey by rail. With this object I took out a second class ticket for my twelve hours' ride, and got my money's worth—fully. Before my next visit I sincerely hope our Bro. Rodger will have patented a second class car. I had several subsequent experiences of N. Z. railway travelling, both on Government and private lines, and I must say that in comparison with the splendid arrangements of N.S.W. it is simply nowhere. And the Manawatu or private line is the greater sinner in this respect. On a public holiday they appear to take off the few carriages which they possess and put on *open* cattle trucks, and having some eight or nine tunnels to go through, you can fancy how the hundreds of ladies and children in their holiday attire look after emerging from the smoke and grime.

When ten miles south of Oamaru we ran into a severe snow storm, quite a novel experience for one elad for the Sydney climate. At Dunedin it was raining steadily and very cold. But Bro. J. Inglis Wright's sunny smile of welcome dispelled a lot of the cheerless gloom, and the chatter of his robust little scions had a soothing effect on a wandering patient. It was a treat to meet so many old faces that I had known 17 or 18 years ago. And my presence there on the Lord's day morning proved quite a pleasant surprise, as most of the folks expected I was then floating about somewhere in the region of the Great Barrier Reef. In consequence of the bungling over my berth, my name, of course, did not appear in any passenger list. And when my name was thus left out the only conclusion they could come to was that I had gone down in the *Waifara*. After an exceedingly enjoyable fortnight spent among the friends there, pleasantly diversified with picnics, surprise parties, and fraternal intercourse with those I had known

long ago. I rolled up my swag and started North again. Preached in Oamaru one night, and the following evening stepped on to the platform at Christchurch, where I was met by quite a number of the church members. While in Dunedin I gave a lecture on Theosophy, when the chair was taken by Sir Robert Stout. I had a good long conversation with that well known gentleman, and formed a very high opinion of him. If the face be any criterion of quality I should say that as a politician he is straight as a gun barrel, and about as destructive when he shoots at any thing he doesn't believe in. And in religion when his views are the result of conviction he will stand by them at any cost for himself. On this latter question, however, I was pleased to note that his views are not precisely what they were. He has, in fact, turned the shadow back upon the wall, and is now taking a tentative view of many matters of importance. He has a strong sympathy with the position taken up by the Churches of Christ, and a kindly recollection of some of our best preachers, M. Woud Green, J. J. Haley, etc.

The ten days spent in Christchurch passed away all too rapidly. It was simply a cup of earthly bliss—that is, a cup with a few bitter drops at the bottom. Some of the old friends were still there, manfully "striving for the faith of the gospel." Some have "gone back and walk no more with us." Two especially who, years ago, were the most forward and useful members of the church, and now in anything but an enviable position. "Ye did run well, who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?" Yes, I left both Dunedin and Christchurch sad at heart. As I noted the mere remnant of the former glory; the wreck that remains from what were once thriving churches, I felt that some unworthy characters are responsible for the terrible condition of things. However, there are too many faithful disciples there to remain long like this. There is yet a bright future ahead. The present is but an eclipse that will ere long pass away and reveal the truth in still greater brightness.

On the shores of Lake Nyassa, in Africa, where a few years ago were to be seen only the habitations of horrid cruelty, there are now numerous Christian schools, with 150 teachers, and 7,000 scholars.

Church News.

All matter for this department should reach the Office by noon on Tuesday. But short items arriving by noon on Wednesday will find a place if there is room. Send all news items direct to A. B. Mason, 328 Elizabeth-street, Carlton.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA.

The quarterly social conference of the S.S. Union was held on Saturday, February 23rd, at Henley Beach. The day was pleasant, and about 50 were present. An unconventional tea was served in the chapel from six to seven, allowing abundance of opportunity for social intercourse. The aftermeeting was very enjoyable and profitable. The Secretary's report was read, and Wm. Matthews gave an essay on the qualifications of officers and teachers in the Sunday School, full of simple, practical suggestions. A vote of thanks to the writer proposed by W. Brooker and seconded by T. D. Verco, was carried very heartily, and gave opportunity to those brethren, as well as R. Verco, Wilson, and the President to refer to the different points touched upon in the paper. Three beautiful hymns and two earnest prayers filled in, and perfected, one of the most edifying and happiest of all the meetings that have been held.

NORTH AUSTRALIA.—Bro. J. C. Dickson has just arranged for a monthly supply of speakers for the church at Wild Horse Plains. They go up on Saturday afternoon by coach, spend the Lord's day there, and return by coach on Monday morning. Jno. Fisher has been there, and enjoyed the fellowship of the brethren. Herbert Moore and Percy Anderson will follow in due course. We trust that mutual blessing will result, and that as a consequence the church may be edified and souls brought into the kingdom of our dear Redeemer. How the prayers of God's people should rise to the throne of grace, not only that more laborers may be sent into the harvest, but that the richest blessing of heaven may be bestowed upon the laborers who are working in it.

Nowoon.—Since reporting last to the columns of the STANDARD we have had four additions—two sisters and two brothers were baptised on a confession of their faith in Jesus as the Christ and their Saviour. May the Father's blessing ever follow them. One of the brethren received is an old man over 70 years of age. It was, with difficulty the poor old brother could descend into the baptistry, but he was determined to carry out the Saviour's command, and his case is only another illustration of the old proverb, "Where there's a will there's a way." The other brother, Mr. White, is at present editor of the *Weekly Herald*, but his out-

spoken manly and Christian utterances have aroused the ire of some ungodly democrats, and he is expecting to receive his "ticket of leave." Bro. White says, rather than sell his conscience and go to the democratic club and report speeches on a Lord's day evening he will give up his position and trust the Lord to supply his need. All our meetings, in connection with the church are well attended.

The visitors during the month have been Bro. Gore, who gave a Bible Reading at one of our endeavor meetings, which was much appreciated, and Bro. Percy Anderson who exhorted the church yesterday morning.

Feb 11.

A. C. RANKINE.

PORT PHOENIX.—Bro. D'Nei, the Conference evangelist, is labouring earnestly among us, and there has been better attendance and an improved tone at our meetings. There is a great deal of prejudice and misconception concerning our position, but we hope to live this down and take a decided forward movement. So far there have been no additions from the world, but three or four members from sister churches have cast in their lot with us, and will, we trust, be of great assistance to the church.

On Jan. 7th a tea meeting was held to welcome Bro. and Sister D'Nei. A number of friends were invited, and about sixty persons sat down to a very enjoyable spread. A public meeting followed, and the chairman, Bro. Duncan, tendered a hearty welcome to Bro. and Sister D'Nei. Stirring addresses by Brethren Langford, Moffitt and D'Nei followed, and a pleasant evening was concluded with singing and prayer. A business meeting was held on Feb. 12, when three deacons were appointed, and the questions of ways and means and the continuance of evangelistic effort were fully discussed.

The inaugural meeting of a Young People's Mutual Improvement Society took place on Feb. 13. The "mild" weather resulted in a thin audience, but those present enjoyed themselves thoroughly. The programme consisted of two practical addresses, readings, recitations, and vocal and instrumental music, &c. We have great hopes that this Society will be very useful to us.

At a meeting held on Feb. 13, presided over by Bro. D'Nei a Portsea Society was organised and the following officers were appointed—President, Mrs. J. Langford; Secretary, Mrs. Palmer; Treasurer, Miss Maggie Moffitt. Meetings are to be held fortnightly.

We have just been cheered by a visit from Brethren Barford and Freestone of Adelaide who met with us and encouraged us by their fellowship. We are always glad to welcome visiting brethren.

Bro. D. Neis' earnest and practical ad-

desires are greatly appreciated by the brethren, and we sincerely trust that while the church is being up-built, we shall also see the tree an ingathering from among the unseeded to the praise and glory of the great head of the Church.

Feb 18

R W D

TASMANIA.

BREAM CREEK.—About 15 or 16 years ago Stephen Creek took up the work of preaching the gospel in the country districts of Tasmania. He then visited Bream Creek, where he met with much opposition. His first baptism of converts numbered 14. The first meeting for worship was in a cottage. The brethren then erected a place for meeting in. Afterwards, advancing a step further, they purchased a piece of land on which they built a neat hall, which seated about 200. The cost was about £200. This was burnt to the ground on the night of 18th Jan last. We are glad to say the building was insured for £150. We hope soon to erect another building.

Relief

S J SMITH

NEW SOUTH WALES.

ESKDALE.—A crowded meeting was held on Friday, Feb 16th, for the purpose of welcoming home Bro Watt and to bid farewell to Bro Turner. In place of the usual tea meeting, a social was held, Bro Hinde occupying the chair, the speakers being Bro Jos Kingsbury sen, W T Clapham, J Colbourne, A F Turner, and C Watt. Refreshments were provided, and during the evening suitable anthems were sung by the choir. We have had another baptism since last report, and last evening two scholars from the Sunday school made the good confession.

C A R

NEW ZEALAND.

WATERLOO.—Since last report we have had the pleasure of seeing two more added to our number by faith and obedience.

Three of our brethren are telling faithful results. We have just had a visit by Bro Wm Todd, back from America, who tarried upon the brethren a practical religion.

During the past month we have had the unpleasant task of purging the church roll, which brought our member down from 92 to 60. Withdrawn from, 26, lost sight of, 6. I may say that about 20 of these withdrawn from have started a meeting in another part of the town. This we believe to be contrary to scripture, and therefore cannot recognize them as a sister church.

Star 4.

R W D Sec

OHAMAU.—The five mentioned in last report as "coming forward" were immersed into Christ a few days later, and duly received into church fellowship, each being presented with a New Testament (4 V) as the church's only standard of doctrine and her great charter of salvation. Last Lord's day we had our largest attendance at the SS—100 save one, and the week before the our largest at "the breaking of bread"—63. The young sisters, following the example of their seniors, have just started a sewing class, which already gives promise of much usefulness.

It will interest STANDARD readers to learn that Bro F W Greenwood, of Auckland, has accepted an invitation from the Ohamau church, and will (we) commence work here

soon after Easter. The present scribe, with his best friend, will be leaving about the beginning of April. Correspondents will please address them c/o F M Lullbrook, 121 Collins-street, Melbourne.

March 4th

A M LULLBROOK

VICTORIA.

NORTH YANAC.—We have done little more than hold our own this year. Three only have been immersed, two of whom have returned to their homes in South Australia. We have held three weekly services for some months past in an unoccupied house belonging to a farmer some five miles distant, but so far nothing visible has resulted. Two or three of our members will be leaving the district shortly for Frankston. Our S School anniversary will be held (day) next Lord's day, and the picnic on the Tuesday following, when, I am sure, all expect to have a good time.

Mar 10.

J W McCALEB, Sec.

CHILTERNHAM.—Although we have no additions to report, there are a few little things that may interest the brethren generally. We have held our Lord's day school anniversary which passed off most successfully. On Feb 20th our church was the scene of a very pretty wedding, the parties being Miss Hodley, and Mr Sidney Chandler. The ceremony was performed by Bro Moysey, and the church was beautifully decorated by the sisters for the occasion. Bro Moysey has been invited to preach for Bro Houchins, Bro Judd again filling his place all day. Yesterday, March 10th, our Sunday school joined in a united gathering of schools in the Protestant Hall, to listen to an address on Temperance by Mr Glover. Bro Moysey presided. March 11.

MILBURN.—Since last report our hearts have been cheered by one dear brother confessing his faith in Christ on Lord's day evening, Feb 17th, our minister preaching from the words, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" On Wednesday evening, 20th, he was buried with his Lord in baptism. May he keep faithful to the end.

The members are doing what they can to hold up the banner of the cross of Christ, and we have indications of further ingathering.

J SIBBON.

KANIVA.—The Annual Conference of the Churches of Christ in the West Wimmera was held in Kaniva on Wednesday, March 14th. It was a most decided success from the beginning to the end. I estimate present. Heavy handshakes were interchanged by brethren and sisters from the participating churches, and eyes sparkled with gleaming the blessed matters "comparing all seemed to realize that it was well as to have been there. Amongst other things it has been decided that three churches assign their representatives to the full extent of during the coming year. That a preacher finance committee be appointed, to consist of delegates from the various churches, to meet quarterly and arrange all matters of church finance, each church to choose its own representatives. "That the same committee, assisted by the circuit preacher, arrange all preaching plans and other work in connection with the gospel work of the circuit." On the question as to whether it

was advisable to have a change of preachers, it was unanimously decided to leave the matter in the hands of the incoming H. M. Committee. Bro John McCallum, of N. Yanac, was appointed president for the present year. Bro Mann was appointed secretary, and Bro Moffett secretary (book of Kaniva). Bro J. S. Mann was appointed to represent the churches of the West Wimmera Conference at the coming general Conference in Melbourne. The conference passed off very well. The sisters who catered laid themselves out for a success and accomplished it. Our business was concluded about 9 p.m. (from 3 to 9 p.m.), after which the meeting, about filling the chapel, was treated to a very thoughtful essay on "Our Responsibilities" by Bro H. Hamlyn of N. Yanac. This was much appreciated. It was our brother's first attempt, and the hearty and deserved approval it received should encourage him to further effort. Bro E. W. Milne, of Bordertown, followed in his usual earnest and impressive manner with an address on "Christian Union." I need scarcely say it had the true ring from first to last. "It is Bible only as a subject," said Bro M.'s address was well received. Then followed another well prepared essay by a young disciple from N. Yanac—Bro Donald McCallum, a son of Bro J. McCallum—on "Church Organisation." This essay evinced much thoughtfulness and care in its preparation, and showed signs of a grand talent possessed by our young brother, only requiring development. It was materially good, well delivered and well received, and I have no doubt we have not (yet) heard the last from Bro D. McCallum. Your minister for once enjoyed the privilege of a listener, drinking in the sights and sounds, and as his thoughts wandered back to years of labour spent, to the scene beside "many waters," where so many present had been "buried by baptism into the death of Christ," he thanked God and took courage. A very happy and profitable time was brought to a close by singing hymn 201 (Sankey's book), hearty hand claps and good-byes followed, and Kaniva Chapel door closed on the West Wimmera Conference for 1895. W. W. TOMLINSON.

OUR NEWS BUDGET.

Read carefully Dr. Verco's paper on "Mistakes about the Bible."

It will also be published in pamphlet form, and will be supplied post free at one shilling per dozen. Copies can be obtained at the Austral Company's office, or from Bro McClellan, 251 Swanston-st.

A few extra copies of the supplement of the STANDARD containing Bro Dunn's reply to Bro Laing have been printed off and can be had at the Austral Company's office on application.

Bro W W Tomlinson reports two conversions at Border Town.

On Feb. 24th there were three conversions at Brisbane. The baptisms took place on Feb 28.

We have received a communication signed "Carter," but without the author's name and address. Will the writer kindly fur-

Several articles held over, among others "M.B." reply to Bro. Hutchinson on "The Antiquity of Man."

We regret to hear that Bro. Smith, M. A., is seriously ill. The last bulletin reported him a little better.

We are pleased to learn that Bro. C. G. Lawson does not intend leaving for the "old country" till after conference.

As Bro. M. W. Green will be in Melbourne during Conference time, he has been asked to give one of the addresses on Home Mission night.

Bro. W. S. Houchins has undergone an operation for his throat, and expects that in the course of two months he will be able to resume preaching.

Bro. McCrackett is now preaching at Moree, N. S. W. We hear that there is a probability of his coming to labour with the church at North Melbourne.

Bro. A. B. Maston will not be back for a week or two, as he wishes to give the remedy he is using a fair trial. We are glad to hear he is somewhat better.

The Victorian Conference Evasyst will be Sister Eliza McCoughtry. The subject she has selected is "Imitators of God." The essay will be given on Tuesday evening, 15th April.

We are sorry to report that a short time ago the chapel at Iream Creek, Tasmania, was burned down. It was fortunately insured. A new building is now in course of erection.

We note that Bro. Fred Greenwood will be taking up the work at Oamaru in succession to Bro. Ludbrook. We congratulate the brethren on obtaining the services of such a good worker, and heartily wish them great prosperity.

The annual meeting of the church in Brisbane was held on Feb. 27th. The work there shows steady progress. During the year twenty-five have been added by faith and obedience. Things in a financial way are not very bright in Brisbane.

It is worthy of note that at Separation the Sunday School is conducted by our aged Sister Masters. She has about reached her three score years and ten, and yet can take a delight in teaching the young. May she long be spared for this good work.

We understand that Bro. A. M. Ludbrook recently received from the Auckland Evangelistic Committee an invitation (contingent upon endorsement by Conference) to labour in the gospel in that part of New Zealand, but that Bro. Ludbrook adheres to his purpose to return to Australia.

Last Lord's day, at Dawson street, Halarat, a man aged seventy years was baptized. After several conversations with some of the sisters he saw that his Lord's command to be baptized was imperative, and walked six miles from the country in order to obey.

Bro. F. Payne, one of the elders of Lygon at church, has gone to Coolgardie, W. A. We understand that he intends to go into partnership with Bro. Chas. Clark, formerly of Footscray church, but who has been in Coolgardie for some time back.

As the time for Victorian Annual Conference is approaching, a number of country delegates are expected in Melbourne. All members who can accommodate delegates should send their names and addresses to M. McLellan, 251 Swanston street, so that the necessary arrangements can be made.

We announced lately that Bro. R. Howard of Galapall has met with a serious accident to his eye. We regret to say that he has had to get it taken out, so as to preserve the sight of the other. He visited Melbourne for the purpose. He is now feeling much better, and will return to Galapall in about a day.

Another valiant soldier of the cross has gone to his rest and his reward. At 9.30 last Lord's day morning Bro. D. Macalister fell asleep in Jesus. He was buried at Melbourne General Cemetery on Tuesday. A large number assembled to show their respect to his memory. Bros. Bryant and Mosey conducted the funeral ceremony. We deeply sympathise with Sister Macalister and family.

Sister Dunn, mother of our senior editor, is now in her seventy-fifth year. Talking to her the other day she spoke of the time when she joined the Church, over forty years ago. Attracted by the notice board hanging outside the old Mechanics Institute, Collins street, she found her way to a small "upper room" where about nine disciples were assembled. We believe she is the only one of that small band still alive and in membership with us.

By last American mail we had encouraging news from Bro and Sister C. L. Thurgood. They had just entered upon their third year at the Central Christian Church, Pittsburgh. The additions during the past year have been 53, 10 by faith and baptism, and 13 otherwise. The Sunday School numbers about 350. At the date of writing, Bro. Thurgood was engaged in holding a "protracted" meeting at Observatory Hill, preaching every night for two weeks (except Saturdays). The result so far had been 9 additions. Altogether these hard workers are evidently as enthusiastic in the work as ever.

From our exchanges we learn that Bro. Hugh McLellan, son of our esteemed manager, has nearly finished his collegiate studies, and has accepted an appointment with the church at Shelbyville, Kentucky. We have watched our young brother's progress with much interest, and have been pleased to hear of his successes both as a student and a preacher. We were in hopes that he would return to these shores and labor

in some of the colonies, but unfortunately this is not to be realised just now. The church at Shelbyville is a large and important one, and his invitation to preach in connection with it is the best indication we can have that our young brother has developed into a good preacher. We wish him every success in his work of preaching the gospel, and trust that we will hear from time to time regarding the progress of his work.

The Collingwood Harvest Festival, held on March 3 and 5, proved a great success. The Tabernacle was beautifully decorated with specimens of the choicest products of garden, orchard and field which could be obtained. Appropriate discourses were given in the morning by Bro. F. Ludbrook, afternoon by Bro. J. Putnam, and evening by Bro. F. Pittman. The large audiences were specially gratifying, in the evening the gallery, in addition to the spacious chapel, was well occupied. One lady confessed Jesus, and the "same hour of the night" was immersed into the trine name. The concluding meeting held on Tuesday was well attended, and a suitable programme was given, in which a number of visitors rendered aid which was highly appreciated. All departments of church work at Collingwood are progressing favorably; prospects for future labors are good, and from the large number at present attending evening services it is anticipated that a harvest of precious souls will soon be reaped.

On Monday, 23rd Feb., the members of the Swanston-street Band of Hope, with a few friends, upwards of 60 in number, were treated to a picnic at Fern Tree Gully by the President, Mr. J. A. Davies, ably assisted by Mrs. Davies. The train left Princes Bridge at 10.20 a.m., and after an enjoyable ride in first-class carriages to Upper Fern Tree Gully, and a pleasant walk, camp was formed near the ranger's residence. Here tea was made and refreshments spread and enjoyed. A photo of the party was taken. While some who did not wish to climb remained at camp, the majority ascended the gully, viewing the beautiful scenery on the way. On reaching the summit, after resting and admiring the fine view, the doxology was sung. Then a leisurely decent, rest, and pleasant conversation and another good spread of refreshments. Mr. and Mrs. Davies finding their pleasure in ministering to the creature wants and enjoyments of all assisted by other willing hands, in which they were very successful, demonstrating that pure, true and solid enjoyment was best obtained away from the intoxicating cup. A vote of thanks was proposed to the host and hostess carried by unanimous three cheers for Mr. Davies and the same for Mrs. Davies in a very happy way. Mr. Davies responded for himself and Mrs. Davies, then wishing their way back to the railway station for the 7.50 train. The party solemnly returned bearing with them the happy memory of their pleasant picnic to Fern Tree Gully.

LOVED ONES GONE BEFORE.

McGowan.—For more than a quarter of a century John Thornburn McGowan has been a representative man among the Disciples of Christ in Victoria. But his labors in our midst are ended.

Our brother was born on September 23, 1856, at Liverpool, England. His father,

James McGowan, was a Presbyterian Minister, but left that occupation, and was engaged as tutor to the Earl of Errol, who was killed at the battle of Waterloo. After this he was the Principal of the Classical and Commercial Academy in Hope street, Liverpool. In 1839 he emigrated to Adelaide with his family, and soon afterwards practised John Thorburn in Mr. Casleford Chemist, Hindley-street, Adelaide, for the term of seven years. Our brother after this came to Melbourne, and was for short periods engaged with one or two leading chemists, until he went over to assist his brother-in-law, who is a doctor at Hobart. After being two years with this gentleman, he suggested to our brother that it would be advisable for him to start business on his own account. He therefore presented himself for examination before the Court of Medical Examiners at Hobart, passed, and commenced business for himself in Murray-street, where Mr. A. P. Miller now has a splendid establishment. Our brother must have been of a roving disposition, for in 1852 he left Hobart, stayed a short time in Melbourne, then went to Calcutta, where he was engaged first by Messrs. Smith and Stanistreet, afterwards by Messrs. Halgate and Co. of Tank Square. He returned to Victoria in 1860, and for about four years earned his livelihood in the neighbourhood of Brighton. During these latter wanderings he, like many other saints of God—John Bunyan and John Newton for instance, tried what gain could be found in the pleasures of sin, but in the good providence of our Heavenly Father, he was led "to taste the good word of God and the powers of the world to come." (Heb. 6: 5), and was baptised by Bro. H. S. Earle of the sea at Neumarai, as I find by a memorandum now before me in the first Bible that he owned, on 18th November, 1864, he then being 28 years of age. I also find on the opposite page there is also in his own hand writing: "Thursday night, October 6th, 1864. Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that seeketh, shall find; and he that knocketh, shall be opened." Christ's sermon on the mount, Gospel of Matthew, 7: 7, 8. "I gather from this that the night of October 6th was that of the crisis in his history. He was admitted to the fellowship of the church on the Lord's day following his baptism. Later that one may just as readily jump from questions of a season of "sowing and reaping," but that I am thankful to say that by the grace of God, whenever he was faintest by his own efforts, he was sustained by always able to challenge him to show that ever returned to these habits. Our brother was not an intimate acquaintance with him, but having been ever since his acquaintance with his family, that he never claimed to be a Christian, ever ready to acknowledge with his apostle, and his grace which was bestowed upon him was not in vain." After his baptism he settled in Ballarat, united and worked with the church at Dawson-street. For a time he was my colleague as elder of this church, and having had the benefit of a good education, "he apt to teach." His mental qualifications, he manifested to be of a high order of hospitality; indeed, it may be said of him as of the Macedonians, that he was

even beyond his power, for his house and shop being centrally situated, it was a regular place of call for visitors, who were always made welcome to rest and refreshment. He was not "given to wine," but a determined foe of the liquor traffic, and as to another qualification of the bishops, he was "not a lover of filthy lucre." The apostle tells us that "the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil"; our brother found by experience that the want of it is another, and certainly it was a very great convenience.

He started business in Ballarat, Armstrong-street, and afterwards purchased that of Mr. W. H. Sheppard in Stout-st. He was chosen secretary to the Ballarat and District Chemists' Association, and was elected to represent this society at the meetings of the Pharmaceutical Council. Shortly after coming to Ballarat he wooed and won the affections of our most estimable Sister Annie Wynne, and they were united in marriage at his residence on his natal day, 1867. In her he found a perfect wife, and so I conclude she was "from the Lord."

In 1882 he sold his business in Ballarat and opened in South Melbourne, where he was chosen City Councillor, and when the news of his death reached the officials there the City Clogs were lowered in his mast high as a mark of respect for his memory. Adversity, however, overtook him, and he removed to Carlton, and was one of the founders of the North Carlton Church.

During his residence in Melbourne he preached in most of the city and suburban churches, supplied Swanston-st. continuously for about a year, went also as far as Castlemaine, Barker's Creek and other country churches, thus working assiduously for an evangelist without any pecuniary reward. Without doubt it may be said of our brother that he was "in labors more abundant." His occupation was so engaging that many persons would have pleaded inability to labor for want of time to prepare. But he was parsimonious of his spare moments. Like St. Walter Scott he appears to have adopted the following maxim:—"I have always made it a rule never to be doing nothing." In intervals in his shop he was attended to; he might be seen standing at his desk behind the counter. Strangers would imagine that he was sitting there, but when in secret knew that he had his MS. before him, and was preparing for the succeeding Lord's day. As a student on our platforms, fluent and practical.

About 24 years ago he removed to Corowa, severe illness, so that all at about half past nine o'clock, while moving in his bed, he was suddenly seized with faintness. His wife was thinking of dressing him; she and what was wrong. "Oh," said he, "it is getting dark." He turned in his bed, and in three minutes he had passed away. Man's life is like unto a winter's day; Others break their fast and so depart away; Others stay at dinner, then depart full fed; The longest age has days and eves to bed.

He has left a widow and nine children to mourn their loss. The six eldest have confessed Christ in baptism. May the great

day of reckoning show that all their vows have been not formal, but genuine from the heart. The last time that our brother was able to attend the gathering of the church was three weeks before his death, when he addressed the brethren on "Prayer and sin"; that he felt that his end was near. So it can be seen by the extract I have given from his Bible that at the commencement and at the close of his spiritual life, in this nether sphere, his thoughts were on the same topic, viz., "Prayer." His remains were interred in the Corowa Cemetery. His Huntsman conducting the funeral service. May He who hearest prayer be a father to the fatherless and a husband to the widow.

"A few more storms shall beat

On this wild, rocky shore,

And we shall be where tempests cease,

And surges swell no more."

Dawson-st., Ballarat.

M.

MACALLISTER FUND.

W. Ashburn, Coolgardie, 100; Church, Port Fairy, 100; A Sister, Port Fairy, 12; R. J. Somerville, 60; Church, Gomborgana, 21; S. Matthews, 50; Bro. Fisher, Cheltenham, 10; W. Ingleswood Forest, 10; P. Wright, 10; H. W. Cummins; Maryborough, G. J.; Geo. Ritchie, 21; Sister E. Jerrens, 21.

W. C. CHAIGIE, Treas.

259 1/2 Collins-street, Melb.

VICTORIAN MISSION FUND.

RECEIPTS TO MARCH 15TH.

South Yarra, per Bro. D. A. Lewis, 21; Malvern, per Sister, Mrs. V. A. 21; Sisters, 44; Drummond, per Sister Gilmore, 11/18; Bordenia (S.A.), 32/7/6; North Yarra, 15/15/0; Kaniva, 13/10/0; Williamstown, 10/-; Galaxuli, per Bro. Howarth, 25; Lygon-st., per Sister 20/0; 21; Sister 10/-; Bro. Quilliam, 10/-; Bro. Joseph Williams, 5/-; Bro. R. Howard (Galaquah), 21; A Brother, Surrey Hills, 21; Bro. L. Martin, Kramkrub, 21; S. C. Stevenson, Perth, 15/6 = 441/0.

357 Swanston-st., W. C. THURGOOD,

Melbourne, Treasurer.

RESCUE HOME.

Gratefully received—Church, June, N.S.W. 21; Mr. T. Richards, Kyabram, 15/-; Col. card, Miss's Archer, Toombulbin, 15/6; A Friend, 11; W. C. T. O. Headquarters, 25; Mr. James Saunders, Roma, 6/-; M. B. G. Mr. John Yercio, Adelaide, South Australia, 21/6; E. W. Ingleswood Forest, 10/-; Brighton Y.P.S.C. Fruit Society, penny donations, 11/6; tin of honey, Mr. Thacker, ditto, Mrs. Collings, 4 chest tea, Mr. C. Edwards, fruit and vegetables, Collingwood, Herwick, St. Albans, Armadale, W. Clifton, Frankton, G. H. Maynez, Cheltenham; W. C. Thurgood, Mrs. M. Fossell, Doncaster; Brighton Harb. Fruit Socy. 21; Col. box, Mr. Maskell, Brighton, 5/3.

J. PITMAN, Armadale.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED.

With Thanks—H. Wright, G. Goodie, Mrs. T. M. Turner, Mrs. J. Everett, Mrs. G. Gilchrist, W. Bradshaw, J. Scott, Mrs. Mansell, Selwood, L. Martin, J. Faulkner, and 10; J. Rogers, 15/-; C. Rogers, 20/-; D. Finlayson, 55/-; Jas. Hastings, 27/6.

251 Swanston-st., Melbourne, Manager.

Printed by the AUSTRALIAN PUBLISHING CO. LIMITED, 325 ELLIOTT STREET, MELBOURNE, and published by MACGILLICRAID & CO., 251 SWANSTON STREET, MELBOURNE. Australian Christian Standard Newspaper Co. 1/10/95.