

The Church Times.

Rev. J. C. Cochran—Editor.

“Evangelical Truth—Apostolic Order.”

W. Gossip—Publisher.

VOL. VII. LONDON, NOVEMBER 20, 1854. NO. 22.

Calendar.

CALENDAR WITH LESSONS.

	MORNING.	EVENING.
Sunday	Deut. 10. Act 10. Isaiah 11. Ps. 139.	Deut. 10. Act 10. Isaiah 11. Ps. 139.
Monday	Gen. 1. 11. 1 Co. 12. Num. 11. 1 Co. 14.	Gen. 1. 11. 1 Co. 12. Num. 11. 1 Co. 14.
Tuesday	1 Sam. 13. 1 Th. 5. 2 Tim. 3. 1 Th. 5.	1 Sam. 13. 1 Th. 5. 2 Tim. 3. 1 Th. 5.
Wednesday	Job 8. Mark 8. Job 9. 2 Cor. 5.	Job 8. Mark 8. Job 9. 2 Cor. 5.
Thursday	Job 10. 12. 13. 14.	Job 10. 12. 13. 14.
Friday	Job 14. 15. 16. 17.	Job 14. 15. 16. 17.
Saturday	Job 17. 18. 19. 20.	Job 17. 18. 19. 20.

From the Athanasian Creed. One of the Ember Week Collects to be used on this day. Verse 15. To verse 21. To verse 10. To verse 20. To verse 23. To verse 18. To verse 21. To verse 13.

Poetry.

THE USE OF THE FLOWERS.

God might have had this earth bring forth,
Enough for great and small,
The oak tree and the cedar tree,
Without a flower at all.
But He has made enough, enough
For every want of ours,
For luxury, medicine, and toil,
And yet have made no flowers.
There with in the mountain side
Requeth none to grow,
He doth it need the lotus flower
To make the river flow.
The clouds might give abundant rain,
The nightly dews might fall,
The herb that keepeth life in man
Might yet have drunk them all.
Wherefore, wherefore were they made,
All dyed with rainbow light,
Adorn'd with supremest grace,
Upspringing day and night;
Singing in valleys green and low,
And on the mountain high,
And in the silent wilderness,
Where no man passeth by?
Our outward life requires them not,
Then wherefore have they birth?
To minister delight to man,
To beautify the earth;
To whisper hope—to comfort man
When'er his faith is dim;
For those care for the flowers
Will care much more for him!
—Mary Howitt.

THE LAW OF LOVE.

BY R. C. THOMAS.

Devot' the oil—pour boldly forth;
It will not fail until
The faintest vessels to provide,
Which it may largely fill.
Make channels for the streams of love,
Where they may broadly run,
And love has overflowing streams
To fill them, every one.
But, at any time, we cease
Such channels to provide,
The very founts of love, for us,
Will soon be parched and dried.
For we must share, if we would keep,
That blessing from above.
Ceasing to give, we cease to have:
Such is the law of love.

Religious Miscellany.

REMARKS OF A JOURNEY ROUND THE DEAD SEA, AND THE BIBLE LANDS, IN 1850 AND 1851. By J. C. Cochran, Member of the French Institute. In 2 vols. London, 1853.

The work, written by a man who though a loyal member of the Church of Rome, finds it not inconsistent with an accepted allegiance to that Church to publish and propagate speculations which are in direct and positive opposition to the broadest principles of textual criticism, has been recently presented in large numbers to both the French and English. Vivid in its descriptions, and varied in its details, it has received; and if it were not for

the book of Genesis, it might be of some authority as a conjectural guide-book to places of which the only topography was to be found in tradition. M. de Sauley, had certain given points—e. g., Cana of Galilee, Zoar, Sodom Gomorrah, Mount Pisgah—and these points were to be “located,” not upon his pre-assumed principles, in accordance with the Bible plan, but in such geographical positions as to a Gallic-medieval taste might seem most appropriate.

Where Cana of Galilee and Mount Pisgah are planted in the new map, we have not time now to relate. It is to the doomed cities that the author's energies were mainly devoted; and if in this case he is allowed to be successful he may well be relied on in all, for he has succeeded in rescuing them from the bottom of the Dead Sea, and landing them in excellent preservation, one on the one and the other on the opposite side of that fatal lake. Not only does he assert that he actually there found them, but he has brought home from their ruins many “curious relics,” and has actually presented to the authorized admiration of the French Church, the cover of King David's Sarcophagus, and a series of equally well authenticated monuments from the cities of the plains.

Zelboim, Sodom, Zoar, and Admah, the party of whom M. de Sauley was the head, successively visited; and subsequently, directly opposite to Sodom, which is at the southern point of the lake, and about seventy miles distant from it, they discovered the ruins of Gomorrah, extending over four miles, and within a short distance from the shore. Could the scriptural narrative be cast aside, there is no doubt that the theory of the identity of these remains with the doomed cities could be plausibly—as it is ingeniously—maintained; and as it is, it has been received without disapprobation by the Romish authorities, and even with approval to at least one English reviewer. We think, however, that its fallacy, so far as concerns the judgment of those who adhere to a natural interpretation of the Bible, has been demonstrated by the following paper by Mr. G. S. Taber, in a late number of the Dublin University Review, extracts from which we insert:

“Now, since I certainly deem the whole theory directly contradicted by SCRIPTURAL RECORD OF FACTS AS CONNECTED WITH GEOGRAPHY, though propounded, I doubt not, with the very best intentions, I cannot think myself out of place in distinctly specifying my objections.

“That it should ever have been supposed that the guilty cities were submerged under the sea, which then and there was ELKVATRO for the purpose, is said by your correspondent to be, in the face of direct assertion to the contrary, both scriptural and classical.

“Here we have two statements, NEITHER of which can be supported—the non-submersion of the cities, and the elevation of the sea.

“I. The alleged direct assertion to the contrary, of the long-established belief as to the geographical site of the destroyed cities, must be sought, according to ‘J. W. C.’ partly in classical and partly in scriptural authorities.

“I. Now, to say nothing of the vagueness of those pagan writers who have concurred in specifying the facts, such as Diodorus and Tacitus and Strabo, and Pliny, and Silius, their statements, from the mere circumstance of their chronological lateness, can be of no evidential value either pro or con. The point must obviously be determined by the very ancient written narrative of Moses, which, to its antiquity, adds the seal of inspiration, precluding all possibility of an inaccurate statement of facts.

“What, then, does this narrative teach us?
“Why, it most unequivocally pronounces that the guilty cities were geographically situated, not on the narrow margin of the present Dead Sea, where M. de Sauley thinks he has discovered their ruins, but in the rich plains of Jordan, described as well watered everywhere, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, and compared to the Garden of the Lord, as exemplified by the fertile and flat land of Lower Egypt.—Gen. xiii. 10.

“Where this flat, fertile, and well watered Jordanian

plain was, there, according to scripture, stood the guilty cities. Hence they are sily and consistently called the Cities of the Plain; that is to say, the plain through the midst of which the river Jordan then flowed; otherwise, it could with no propriety have been denominated the plain of Jordan.—Gen. xiii. 10, 12.

“2. The geographical locality of this fertile plain, which was extensive enough to make Lot desire it for the pasturage of his numerous herds and flocks, agreeably to the nomadic habits of the East, is the next point to be ascertained; and this is a matter of prime importance to the present question; for, if we can ascertain the geographical locality of the plain, it is quite clear that we shall also ascertain the geographical locality of the cities.

“Now, it is obvious that a well watered plain, termed the whole plain of Jordan, (Gen. xiii. 10.) and chosen by Lot as much preferable to the plains in the south of Canaan for the purpose of extensive pasturage, can by no possibility be the narrow margin of the present Dead Sea, even though, previous to the catastrophe, it was not volcanically blasted as at present.—Such a strip of land at the foot of lofty mountains both on the west and on the east, if we suppose the Dead Sea to have been then in existence, answers not to the character of a fertile plain, well watered everywhere, and compared to the Delta of Lower Egypt. The plain chosen by Lot, must, on the contrary, have been the plain watered by the southern Jordan; for in point of fact, the Dead Sea was not then in existence, though it now occupies the region between the mountains of Judah and the mountains of Moab, which was previously occupied by that great and eminently fertile plain.

“This point is fully established by more than a single fact.

“Burckhardt has ascertained that, after flowing through the great plain, and after having been made to irrigate it by various artificial, or perhaps natural channels, like the Nile in Egypt, the Jordan again became protracted, and, passing along a rocky and now deserted bed, ultimately fell into the eastern horn of the Red Sea.

“Accordingly we are told that, when Lot separated from Abram, after they had been jointly pasturing their cattle in the southern plains of the land of Canaan, he journeyed EASTWARD, inasmuch as he had chosen for himself all the plain of Jordan. Gen. xiii. 11, 12, 18.

“From these ascertained points, nothing can be more clear than that the whole of the once fertile plain of Jordan is now covered by the waters of the Dead Sea. Consequently, since the guilty Cities of the Plain, as the very name descriptively imports, were built in different parts of this plain, they also, or what remains of them, must be now similarly covered by the same great asphaltic lake.

“With this exactly accord the scriptural accounts of the movements of Lot:—

“Abram dwelled in the land of Canaan; and Lot dwelled in the Cities of the Plain, and pitched his tent toward Sodom.—Gen. xiii.

“That is to say: Lot, for the convenience of pasturage, moved about from one city of the plain to another, until he had finally pitched his tent toward Sodom, shortly before the occurrence of the fearful volcanic eruption. Ultimately, however, we find him occupying a house in Sodom, while doubtless his herdsmen were then pasturing his cattle in the immediately neighbouring part of the great plain.—Gen. xix. 1-6.

“4. In the scriptural account of the catastrophe, no mention is or could be made of the lake; because the Jordan had not then formed it, by filling up the huge chasm.

“Hence we are consistently told, that when Abram gat up early on the morning of the following day, he looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and toward ALL the land of the plain; and lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace.—Gen. xix. 27, 28.

“He saw no lake, because in so short a time no lake could have been formed by the influx of the Jordan. But when Moses wrote some centuries later than the