

The BEREAN.

THEY RECEIVED THE WORD WITH ALL READINESS OF MIND, AND SEARCHED THE SCRIPTURES DAILY, WHETHER THOSE THINGS WERE SO.—Acts xvii. 11.

VOLUME IV.—No. 34.]

QUEBEC, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1847.

[WHOLE NUMBER 190

THE GLORIOUS WORKS OF GOD.

I praised the earth, in beauty seen,
With garlands gay of various green;
I praised the sea, whose ample field
Shone glorious as a silver shield;
But earth and ocean seemed to say,
"Our beauties are but for a day."

I praised the sun, whose chariot rolled
On wheels of amber and of gold;
I praised the moon, whose softer eye
Smiled sweetly through the summer sky;
But moon and sun in answer said,
"Our days of light are numbered."

O God! O good beyond compare,
If these thy meeker works are fair,
If these thy beauties gild the span
Of ruined earth and sinful man,
How glorious must those mansions be
Where thy redeemed ones dwell with thee.

Heber.

NINEVEH.

PROPHECIES AND FULFILMENT.
Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, was for a long time an extensive and populous city. Its walls are said, by heathen historians, to have been a hundred feet in height, sixty miles in compass, and to have been defended by fifteen hundred towers, each two hundred feet high. Although it formed the subject of some of the earliest of the prophecies, and was the very first which met its predicted fate, yet a heathen historian, in describing its capture and destruction, repeatedly refers to an ancient prediction respecting it. Diodorus Siculus relates, that the King of Assyria, after the complete discomfiture of his army, confided in an old prophecy, that Nineveh would not be taken unless the river should become the enemy of the city; that, after an ineffectual siege of two years, the river, swollen with long-continued and tempestuous torrents, inundated part of the city, and threw down the wall for the space of twenty furlongs; and that the king, deeming the prediction accomplished, despaired of his safety, and erected an immense funeral pile, on which he heaped his wealth, and with which himself, his household, and palace were consumed. The book of Nahum was prophetically of the destruction of Nineveh; and it is therefore foretold "that the gates of the river shall be opened, and the palace shall be dissolved." "Nineveh of old, like a pool of water—with an overflowing flood he will make an utter end of the place thereof." The historian describes the facts by which the other predictions of the prophet were as literally fulfilled. He relates that the King of Assyria, elated with his former victories, and ignorant of the revolt of the Bactrians, had abandoned himself to scandalous inaction; had appointed a time of festivity, and supplied his soldiers with abundance of wine; and that the general of the army, supported by the loyalty of their nobles, and drunkness, attacked the Assyrian army, while the whole of them were fearlessly giving way to indulgence, destroyed great part of them, and drove the rest into the city. The words of the prophet were hereby verified: "While they are drunken together as thorns, and while they are drunken as drunkards, they shall be devoured as stubble full dry." The prophet promised much spoil to the enemy: "Take the spoil of silver, take the spoil of gold; for there is no end of the store and glory out of all the pleasant furniture." And the historian affirms, that many talents of gold and silver, preserved from the fire, were carried to Ecbatana. According to Nahum, the city was not only to be destroyed by an overflowing flood, but the fire was also to devour it; and, as Diodorus relates, partly by water, partly by fire it was destroyed.

The utter and perpetual destruction and desolation of Nineveh were foretold:—"The Lord will make an utter end of the place thereof. Affliction shall not rise up the second time. She is empty, void and waste.—The Lord will stretch out his hand against the north, and destroy Assyria, and will make Nineveh a desolation, and dry like a wilderness. How is she become a desolation, a place for beasts to lie down in?" In the second century, Lucian, a native of a city on the banks of the Euphrates, testified that Nineveh was utterly perished—that there was no vestige of it remaining—and that none could tell where once it was situated. This testimony of Lucian, and the lapse of many ages during which the place was not known where it stood, render it at least somewhat doubtful whether the remains of an ancient city, opposite to Mosul, which have been described as such by travellers, be indeed those of ancient Nineveh. It is, perhaps, probable that they are the remains of the city which succeeded Nineveh, or of a Persian city of the same name, which was built on the banks of the Tigris by the Persians subsequently to the year 230 of the Christian era, and demolished by the Saracens in 632. In contrast with the then existing great and increasing population, and the accumulating wealth of the proud inhabitants of the mighty Nineveh, with the utter ruin that awaited it,—the word of God (before whom all the inhabitants of the earth are as grasshoppers) by Nahum was—"Make thyself many as the canker-worm, make thyself many as the locusts. Thou hast multiplied thy merchants above the stars of heaven; the canker-worm spoileth, and flyeth away. They crowned are as the locusts, and thy captains as the great grasshoppers which camp in the hedges in the cold day; but when the sun riseth, they flee away; and their place is not known where they are," or were. Whether these words imply that even the site of Nineveh would in future ages be uncertain or unknown; or as they rather seem to intimate, that every vestige of the palaces of its monarchs, or of the greatness of its nobles, and of the wealth of its numerous merchants

would wholly disappear; the truth of the prediction cannot be invalidated under either interpretation. The avowed ignorance respecting Nineveh, and the oblivion which passed over it, for many an age, conjoined with the meagerness of evidence to identify it still, prove that the place was long unknown where it stood, and that, even now, it can scarcely with certainty be determined. And if the only spot that bears its name, or that can be said to be the place where it was, be indeed the site of one of the most extensive of cities on which the sun ever shone, and which for many centuries continued to be the capital of Assyria—the "principal mounds," few in number, which "show neither bricks, stones, nor other materials of building, but are in many places overgrown with grass, and resemble the mounds, left by entrenchments and fortifications of ancient Roman camps;" and the "appearances" of other mounds and ruins less marked than even these, extending for ten miles, and widely spread, and seeming to be "the wreck of former buildings," show that Nineveh is left without one monument of royalty, without any token whatever of its splendour or wealth; that their place is not known where they were; and that it is indeed a desolation—"empty, void, and waste," its very ruins perished, and less than the wreck of what it was. "Such an utter ruin," in every view, has been made of it; and such is the truth of the divine predictions."¹

UNANIMOUS CONSENT. WHERE TO FIND IT.

As for expounding Scripture by the unanimous consent of primitive Fathers, this is indeed the rich which the Council of Trent gives, and which their doctors swear to observe. How well they keep their oath, they ought to consider. Now as to this, you may tell them that you would readily pay a great deference to the unanimous consent of Fathers, could you tell how to know it; and therefore in the first place you desire to know the agreement of how many Fathers makes an unanimous consent; for you have been told, that there has been a great variety in interpreting Scripture among the ancient Fathers as among our modern interpreters; that there are very few, if any, controverted texts of Scripture which are interpreted by an unanimous consent of all the Fathers. If this unanimous consent then signify all the Fathers, we shall be troubled to find such a consent in expounding Scripture. Must it, then, be the unanimous consent of the greatest number of Fathers? This will be a very hard thing, especially for unlearned men to tell us; we can know the opinion only of those Fathers who were the writers in every age, and whose writings have been preserved down to us; and who can tell whether the major number of those Fathers who did not write, or whose writings are lost, were of the same mind with those whose writings we have? And why must the major part be always the wisest of a few wise men, and of those great and sagacious numbers of other expositors? Again ask them, whether these Fathers were infallible or traditional expositors of Scripture, or whether they expounded Scripture according to their own private reason and judgment. If they were infallible expositors and delivered the traditionary sense and interpretation of Scripture, it is a little strange how they should differ in their expositions of Scripture.

If they expounded Scripture according to their own reason and judgment, as it is plain they did, then their authority is no more sacred than their reason is; and those are the best expositors, whether ancient or modern, whose expositions are backed with the best reasons. We think it a great confirmation of our faith that the Fathers of the Church in the first and best ages did believe the same doctrines, and expound Scripture in great and concerning points, much to the same sense that we do, and therefore we refuse not to appeal to them, but yet we do not wholly build our faith upon the authority of the Fathers, we forsake them, where they forsake the Scriptures, or put perverse senses on them.

There is no other way, then, left of understanding Scripture, but to expound it as we do our own writings; by considering the signification and propriety of words and phrases, the scope and context of the place, the reasons of things, and the like. When they dispute with Protestants they can reasonably pretend to another way of expounding Scripture, because we admit of no other.—*Sherlock's Preservative.*

Instead of flourishing high-sounding words against us about the infallibility of "the catholic church," and the certainty of what "everybody always" everywhere has believed, let them set themselves to produce the passages in which such tradition of doctrine or traditionary interpretation of Scripture is delivered, and thus show its reception by "everybody always everywhere." In this they might afford us some proof of that patristical learning for which they take credit; and of which they certainly have not yet favoured the public with any very abundant testimony. And to show them that we have no wish to be hard upon them, we will offer them a doctrine upon which to try their powers in such a research, which they have themselves very prominently put forward as derived from "tradition;" viz., the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. Will any one of our opponents give us a Catena Patrum for this doctrine for the first few centuries, showing that during that period not only did no Father speak somewhat inconsistently with such a doctrine, but, on the contrary, that all delivered that doctrine with one consent? Let us see the evidence traced and drawn out. And he it remembered that it is to be so clear, as to counterbalance the (alleged) obscurity of Scripture in this point. It is not clear, say our opponents, in Scripture: but only go to church-tradition, and you will find that all the Fathers have clearly, and unambiguously, and with one consent, delivered it. I beg to ask, then, for the proofs upon which this statement rests. I do this by no means denying that it has been in my belief a truth held by the orthodox part of the visible church from the beginning, because I hold it to be a fundamental truth revealed in Scripture, and that we can find a stream of testimony in its favour, running down to us

from the beginning. But I ask for the proofs of this boasted catholic consent for it. Suppose the attempt made. Will they include all those who have belonged to the visible church? No, they will say, we must go to the Fathers of the Catholic Church only, and not think that the agreement of such heretics as those that opposed the doctrine, is necessary. So, then, in the first step, the truth of the doctrine to be established, is assumed. But suppose it granted that we are to go only to the Fathers of the Catholic Church. What evidence, I beg to ask, could we show that there was catholic consent for it in the first three centuries? Moreover, Arius appealed to tradition as in his own favour. And Athanasius, though he referred to the tradition of a few ancient authors as in favour of the doctrine, does not claim catholic consent from the beginning in its favour; a claim, indeed, which, had he made it, could not have been alone a sufficient ground for faith to build upon; and as to Mr. Keble's notion that the Fathers at Nice affirmed that the doctrine there agreed upon had been taught in all their churches from the beginning, it has not the least particle of evidence to rest upon. Or let them take the doctrine of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, and show us the proofs of catholic consent in its favour, for the first three centuries; and they will find, if they attempt it, that both Basil and Jerome will laugh at them for their pains; the one telling them that the doctrine was passed over in silence and left unexplained, and that some were insert only respecting it; and the latter, that many through ignorance of the Scriptures, and Lactantius among the number, erred respecting it.

Again, then, I say to our opponents, you talk about catholic consent and traditionary interpretations of Scripture received by "the catholic church;" for the whole Christian Church, produce your proofs of such consent, deal no longer in vague generalities, but let us know how many, and what names of doctrine can be thus proved, and present us with the proofs; and I will venture to say, that the *honesty* and *partiality* of the Catena, where some ten or a dozen men will appear as the *uncontested* representatives of as many millions, and a few sentences (some probably ambiguous and equivocal) of fallible men, pretending to nothing more than to deliver what, to the best of their knowledge and belief, was the truth, will be delivered to us as an infallible interpretation of Scripture, will be the best answer in reply to all the claims made for "tradition."—*Goode's Divine Rule of Faith and Practice.*

DEATH TO SIN.

As our sin was the cause of Christ's death, his death is the death of sin in us; and that not simply as he bore a moral pattern of it, but as the real working cause of it. The death of Christ has, in this respect, an effectual influence on the soul, kills it to sin:—"I am crucified with Christ," says St. Paul, Gal. ii. 20. Faith so looks on the death of the heart, kills it unto sin. "Christ dyeth for us, not only to become one in law, so as to deliver us from the guilt of sin, but also to deliver us from the power of sin, so as to give us a new nature, so as to give us a new life. Baptized into his death," (Rom. vi. 3.) is. 181.

The nature of this conformity (to show the nearness of it) is expressed in the very same terms as in the pattern; it is not a remote resemblance, but the thing, even "suffering in the flesh." But that we may understand rightly what suffering is here meant, it is plainly this, "ceasing from sin;" so that "suffering in the flesh" is not simply the enduring of all afflictions, which is a part of a Christian's conformity to his Head, Christ, (Rom. viii. 29.) but implies a more inward and spiritual suffering. It is the suffering and the dying of our corruption, the taking away the life of sin by the death of Christ; and that death of his sinless flesh, that is, the corruption of his nature, which is so usually in Scripture called flesh. ii. 180.

The spiritual suffering and dying with him is the universal way of all his followers; they are all martyrs thus in the crucifying of sinful flesh, and so dying for him and with him. And they may well go cheerfully through. Though it bear the unpleasant name of death, yet, as the other death is, (which make it so little terrible, yea, often to appear so very desirable to them) so is this the way to a far more excellent and happy life; so that they may pass through it gladly, both for the company and end of it. It is with Christ they go into his death, as unto life in his life. Though a believer might be free from these terms, he would not. No, surely; could he be content with that easy life of sin, instead of the divine life of Christ! No, he will do this, and "not accept of deliverance, that he may obtain" (as the apostle speaks of the martyrs,) "a better resurrection," Heb. xi. 35. Think on it again, you to whom your sins are dear still, and this life sweet: you are yet far from Christ and his life. ii. 181.—*Selection from Archbishop Leighton.*

EVANGELICAL KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY.

We intimated a week or two since, that although topics and transactions of much interest were at that time under consideration in the General Convention, yet in our opinion, events of still greater importance to the Church were transpiring out of doors. As might have been expected, many persons were drawn together in New York while this great Council was in session, from different sections of the land. Some of these held many conferences with each other respecting the condition of our ecclesiastical affairs. It seemed to be the universal sentiment that the time had arrived when Evangelical men were called upon to adopt decisive measures in support of their peculiar principles; unless indeed, they are willing to have the Church overrun with opposite opinions. Four or five meetings were successively convened, each one larger than that by which it was preceded, until at length a numerous assembly of Clergymen and Laymen from all sections of our country were assembled. The result of their prayers and deliberations was the formation of "The Protestant Episcopal Society for the Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge."

This name was taken from the well known Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge in England. It was deemed proper, however, to prefix the words "Protestant Episcopal," as designating the relations of the new Society to our own Church, and to substitute "Evangelical" for "Christian," as being the more explanatory and distinctive term.

The President of the Society is Bishop Meade. The Vice-Presidents are Bishops Melville, Johns, Eastburn, and several other Bishops who have expressed their approbation of the object of the Society, but have not yet had an opportunity of signing the Constitution. The Committee to draft the Constitution, was Dr. Stone, Dr. Johns, and the Rev. Messrs. Cook, Andrews, and Ridgely. The Executive Committee (on whom all the powers of the Board are devolved during its recess,) are the Rev. Messrs. Fowles, Newton, Suddards and Stone, and four laymen, whose names we do not recollect. The Board of Managers is a very large one, taken from almost all the dioceses. It will meet annually. The stated meetings of the Society will be triennial, and at the place where the General Convention shall assemble.

The operations of the Society are for the present confined to the publication of Sunday-school Books and Tracts. More important work, or work more imperiously called for by the exigencies of the Church, could not well be designated. We confess, however, that it is not on this account chiefly, that we rejoice at the formation of the new association; although the supply of a safe Juvenile and Tract literature will be acknowledged to be a benefit, whose value cannot very well be estimated. Such an association will necessarily put the friends of evangelical religion throughout our borders, into communication with each other. And this cannot fail to impart increased vigour to their action, and strength to their cause. Another result also is likely to follow such a movement. A Society which is formed upon the principle of "elective affinity" (as this has been,) is not likely always to restrict itself to one mode of operation. The same causes which created a necessity for its existence in one field of benevolent exertion, will ultimately be found to operate in every other, and to require the application of a similar principle of combination to them all. It is impracticable for those who differ so widely in theological sentiment, to co-operate in the publication of Tracts or Sunday-school books, it cannot be found a very easy matter to unite them harmoniously for any great length of time, in the selection and support of missions—even who are but the living exponents of the same clashing opinions. If consistency, and the desire for a peaceful prosecution of their respective objects, require separate organization in the one case, how long is it likely to be avoided in the other? If a man cannot subscribe to a Tract or Sunday-school Society, let his money should be made to propagate false opinions, with what consistency can he contribute to a missionary association in which his funds are liable to a similar and perhaps more serious perversion?

PIRATES IN THE GREECAN SEAS.

We had not been long resident in Athens before an event occurred which created very general sensations of anxiety and sorrow. A letter received by Baron Haller from his accomplished and amiable wife, told that his most beautiful daughter, Miss Volto, that his most beautiful daughter, Miss Volto, had torn to pieces before his face, his clothes carried off, and himself hurried along with these savages in their detestable enterprises, who forced him to sleep in the open air, and at last displayed instruments of torture for the purpose of terrifying him into the promise of a larger ransom. This they set at 60,000 piastres, and dispatched a messenger with the Baron's letter to Athens.

A consultation was immediately held at the house of the French consul; but as this enormous sum was not only too great to be raised, but to be resisted upon every principle of policy towards others as well as the captive himself, the case required great delicacy of management, and only one person was thought to possess the qualifications requisite to conduct it happily. This was an Armenian merchant settled in Athens, named Acob, whose information in the languages, manners, and customs of different nations was unbounded, and whose honesty was unsuspected. He was unfortunately absent upon commercial speculations in Bœotia or Phœcis, and not expected to return in less than a month; but this obstacle did not long remain. After it had been determined that 12,000 piastres should be offered to the handitti, and the sum was raised, Baron Haller took charge of it and set out in quest of the Armenian.

This faithful friend scarcely rested day or night till he found Acob, and proceeded with him towards the haunts of the banditti; but as no reward could induce any person of the neighbourhood to undertake the office of mediator, they resolved to venture at once into the retreat of the horde; and having by some scouts obtained a knowledge of the station, they advanced thither boldly, to the great joy of the poor captive, who was become extremely feeble from the effects of bad food, bad air, and a fever brought on by his sufferings. The conference was opened by Acob with singular address; he represented himself as the captain of a privateer in those seas, assured the pirates that they were mistaken in supposing their prisoner to be a man of fortune, since he was merely an artist labouring for his bread, whose prospects they had already injured by the destruction of his drawings; that if they rejected the offers now made of 10,000 piastres, he should depart, satisfied with having done his duty; finally he represented to them that a Turkish man of war was on the coast, as really was the case, to the commander of which, if they continued obstinate, he should leave their punishment; but the robbers, though they were somewhat abashed by the eloquence, confidence, and tone of authority which he used, suffered him to depart without coming to any conclusion.

Firmness was now necessary: this Acob saw and persevered notwithstanding the pain it might give both to the prisoner and to Baron Haller; that generous man, however, unable to bear the anxiety which he suffered on account of his friend, stepped forward and urged the captain of the gang by every entreaty to release the prisoner, and to accept himself as an hostage until the other should recover. This noble offer, though rejected, was made in perfect sincerity of heart; the risk was great—the pirates were irritated—in all probability they would torture their prisoner for the purpose of succeeding better in their terms of ransom—and if they should chance to be pursued by the Turkish frigate, they would inevitably put all their captives to death and throw them overboard.

The disappointed negotiators returned to sleep at the nearest village; where about midnight they were awakened by one of the banditti, who came to propose 20,000 piastres for the ransom, which he gradually reduced to 15,000 as the lowest sum. Acob however, conjecturing that they were in some alarm, remained steady to his former determination, which soon brought the chief himself to their lodging, where the bargain was at last concluded for 10,000 piastres, and an additional present of one thousand to the captain. A shake by the hand was the seal of this negotiation, as sacred and as valid as the sultan's firman.

Next morning Baron Haller proceeded to the place appointed by the robbers, and being seated, like all the rest, cross-legged upon a carpet, he counted out the money in their presence. Baron Stackelberg was then shared by one of the gang, a ceremony which is never omitted, and given over to his friends. They were all pressed much to stay and partake of a roasted lamb about to be prepared, but were too desirous of quitting such company, to accept their proffered hospitality. The robbers then wished them a good journey and expressed their hopes of capturing them again at a future time and pocketing some more of their cash.

The account given of these wretches was curious. They were composed of outlaws and villains from every part of Greece, the very dregs of society in a country where humanity is neither generally admitted nor practised. They were mostly Mussulmen, but with a very imperfect knowledge of their faith; and in the hour of danger they had recourse to all kinds of superstition, though when secure they indulged in the most horrid blasphemies. In their bark a light was always kept burning before a picture of the virgin, and in storms they vowed wax-tapers to St. Nicholas, the Neptune of modern Greece, for a church dedicated to that saint which they sometimes visited; and these vows were religiously performed. In the day-time they drew their bark ashore and crowded it with rushes, making their excursions at night. With regard to any capture, if it were money, they divided it immediately among the gang; if goods which were portable, they put them up to sale amongst themselves. For this purpose Baron Stackelberg, who saw his trunks filled and emptied, was obliged to tell them the prime cost of every article, which was disposed of to the highest bidder. When they came to his firm, though they could not read it, they kissed and applied it to their foreheads in token of submission to the Sultan.

So great is the terror caused by these villains that they are seldom resisted: the unfortunate vessels which fall in their way generally submit at once, or run ashore if they happen to be near the land, when the crew endeavour to effect their escape. An occurrence of this kind took place during Baron Stackelberg's captivity: a vessel, rather than be taken, ran aground, and the unfortunate sailors climbed the rocks to avoid their pursuers; but an old man less active than the rest being shot was thrown overboard, was carried and taken back for his thirst for blood, seized a poor goat that was quietly grazing near him, and cutting its throat with his ataghan, hurled the bleeding carcass down the rocks.—*Rev. T. S. Hughes's Travels in Greece.*

HAZARDOUS USE OF THE ELECTRIC TELEGRAPH.

From a London Paper.

An extraordinary instance of the application of the electric telegraph occurred on Thursday at the London Bridge terminus of the South-Eastern Railway. Hutchings, the man found guilty and sentenced to death for poisoning his wife, was to have been executed at Maidstone Gaol at twelve o'clock. Shortly before the appointed hour for carrying the sentence into effect, a message was received at the London Bridge terminus from the Home Office; requesting that an order should be sent by the electric telegraph, instructing the Under-Sheriff at Maidstone to stay the execution two hours. By the agency of the electric telegraph the communication was received at Maidstone with the usual rapidity, and the execution was for a time stayed. It seems that the Under-Secretary of State had been in conference with a gentleman who had interested himself in the case, and a re-examination of the evidence was humanely determined on; pending the consultation the Under-Secretary ordered the temporary respite. Shortly after the transmission of the order deferring the execution for two hours, a messenger from the Home Office conveyed to the railway the Secretary of State's order that the law was to take its course, and that the culprit was to be at once executed. As we have heard it stated, Mr. Macgregor, Chairman of the South-Eastern Railway, happened to be at the terminus when this order arrived. The telegraph clerk hesitated in sending such a message without instructions, and the propriety of transmitting it was accordingly submitted to Mr. Macgregor. The messenger from the Home Office could not be certain that the order for Hutchings's execution was signed by the Home Secretary, although it bore his name; and accordingly Mr. Macgregor, with great judgment and humanity, instantly decided that was not a sufficient authority on such a momentous matter. It now became the duty of Mr. James Walter, the chief superintendent of the South-Eastern Railway, to see the Home Secretary on the subject of the message, and accordingly Mr. Walter proceeded to Downing-street, and stated to Sir Denis Le Marchant, the Under-Secretary of State, that the railway company, in being required to deal with such a matter as a man's execution, must have the signature of the order affixed in the presence of their responsible officer; that the second telegraphic message was in fact a death warrant, and that Mr. Walter must have undoubted evidence of its correctness. It is stated that on Mr. Walter drawing the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that the transmission of such a message was in effect to make him the sheriff, the conduct of the railway company in requiring unquestionable evidence and authority was warmly approved. The proper signature was affixed in Mr. Walter's presence, and the telegraph then conveyed to the criminal the sad news that the suspension of the awful sentence was only temporary. Hutchings was executed soon after it reached Maid-

* Diad. Sic. lib. ii. p. 82, 83. Ed. Wessel, 1793.

+ *Ibid.* p. 84.

§ Nahum ii. 6. i. 8.

¶ Diad. Sic. lib. ii. p. 81, 84.

** Nahum i. 10; iii. 2.

§ *Ibid.* ii. 9.

¶ *Ibid.* ii. 87.

† Nahum iii. 15.

‡ Nahum i. 8, 9; ii. 10; iii. 17, 18, 10. Zeph. ii. 13.

§ *Ibid.* i. 15.

¶ *Abraham's Can. Chron.* sec. xvii. p. 600. Ed. France, 1836.

* Buckingham's Travels in Mesopotamia, vol. ii. p. 49, 51, 62.

† See Bishop Newton's Dissertations.