

The Christadelphian Lamp

“Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.” Psalm cxix, 105.

Vol. 1.

NOVEMBER 1873.

No. 1.

CONTENTS

Page 2	Introduction	Editor
Page 2	The “Unanswerable” Answer	Dr S.G.Hayes
Page 7	Had The Law of Moses Power to Give Eternal Life?	
Page 10	Extract from Archbishop Whateley’s Christian Faiths	
Page 11	Prayer in Secret	Editor
Page 13	“Questions and Questions” Considered	Editor
Page 14	Did Jesus Eat and Drink the Emblems of His own Blood?	Editor
Page 17	Intelligence	

“There are no such powerful means of disciplining the whole moral man as is found in secret prayer. There we must pray for forgiveness as we forgive those who have offended against us.”

“Either make the tree good
and his fruit good;
or else make the tree corrupt
and his fruit corrupt:
for the tree is known by its fruit.”

Matthew 12:33

INTRODUCTION

Had we listened to the suggestions of friends, a periodical, advocating the truth, would long since have been taken in hand by us. The way, however, has never appeared quite clear until now. Not that the recently developed ideas concerning Jesus Christ are by any means the sole cause of our talking up the position of editor: they are not; yet the previous thought of doing so has no doubt been thereby matured into a decided resolution. Large numbers of the brethren in various parts of the country, who firmly and thankfully rejoice with us in the “new light” feel themselves cut off by the action of the Christadelphian, and, therefore, are desirous that their views should find a permanent and clear utterance. This is the reason of our consenting to become their public mouth-piece at the present time. It is hardly needful to remark that our faith in “the things concerning the kingdom of God” has not been shaken by the acquisition of the glorious truth that the Christ was not under sentence of death through Adam’s sin: on the contrary, we find it much strengthened; we discern more clearly the ratification of the Abrahamic covenant; “the sure mercies of David” are now to our minds sure indeed; the scheme of their confirmation now appears like a “morning without clouds;” having all the freshness of “tender grass by clear shining after rain.” It will be our earnest endeavour to bring forth from the rich store house of the Word “things new and old.” And while we endeavour to “increase in knowledge,” the right use of that knowledge will be regularly enforced. Practical as well as intellectual Christianity must be a distinguishing characteristic of the high vocation wherewith we are called; men must see our “good works” as well as hear our “good words,” that they may have a double motive to glorify our Father who is in Heaven.

THE “UNANSWERABLE” ANSWERED. BY DR. S. G. HAYES.

THE adoption of the above title calls for a few words of explanation from the author of the following strictures on an article* (see Footnote) which appeared in the September number of a monthly periodical professedly “devoted to the exposition and defence of the faith preached by the Apostles,” and well known to most Christadelphians.

In calling the attention of his readers to the article in question, the Editor says, “It is an unanswerable demonstration of the fact that Jesus had to come under both the Adamic and Mosaic curses before he could, in God’s arrangements, bear them away.”

A careful perusal of the article did not result in the present writer endorsing the Editor’s opinion; on the contrary, he came to the conclusion that it was not by any means an “unanswerable” demonstration of the alleged facts concerning Jesus, but a demonstration rather of reasoning on false premises. And such being the case, he concluded to take up his pen with the view of exposing the fallacies on which the conclusions are based. How far he has succeeded in his task of answering the “unanswerable” the readers of the Christadelphian Lamp must be left to judge for themselves. He has arranged his remarks under two principal heads, putting the first in the form of a question, namely: -

WHY WAS JESUS BAPTIZED?

The best reply that can be given to this question is contained in the Lord’s own words in answer to John, saying, “Suffer it to be so now for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.” (Matthew 3:15). “That is” (as Parkhurst remarks in his Lexicon for explaining the words of the Greek Testament,) “to perform all the works and submit to all the ordinances appointed by God.” Exact conformity to all the requirements of the Deity, according to the order of things under which he lived, was characteristic of Jesus throughout the whole of his career. It was his meat to do his heavenly Father’s will – His law was within his heart. He was obedient in all things, and always did those things that pleased God. And his submission to John’s baptism was an eminent example of his obedience at the very commencement of his public ministry. His earnest desire that the Scripture should be fulfilled to the very letter is brought prominently into view on numerous occasions, and that it might not be broken he meekly submitted to every insult and every indignity. “He hid not his face from shame and spitting.”

John's proclamation was addressed to the Jewish nation, and in response thereto we read (Matthew iii. 5, 6.) "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." As one of that nation, it was incumbent on Jesus likewise to render obedience by being immersed, not because he had any sins to confess, or anything of which to repent, for, being absolutely without sin, he needed no repentance, but for the reason already mentioned, namely, "to fulfil all righteousness." On this passage Macknight on the Apostolic Epistles (vol. i. essay i.) remarks, "The son of God, in prosecution of the purpose for which he took on him the human nature, came to John at Jordan and was baptised. To this rite he submitted, not as it was the baptism of repentance, for he was perfectly free from sin, but as it prefigured his dying and rising again from the dead, and because he was on that occasion to be declared God's beloved Son by a voice from heaven, and by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon him in the view of the multitudes who were assembled to John's baptism."

On Matthew iii. 15, Adam Clarke observes, "To fulfil all righteousness." That is, every righteous ordinance: so I think the words *πασαν δικαιοσυνην* should be translated, and so our common version renders a similar word. (Luke i. 6.) The following passage quoted from Justin Martyr will doubtless appear a strong vindication of this translation: "Christ was circumcised, and observed all the ordinances of the Law of Moses, not with a view to his own justification, but to fulfil the dispensation committed to him by the Lord, the God and Creator of all things." Wakefield.

But was this an ordinance? Undoubtedly it was the initiatory ordinance of the Baptist's dispensation. Now as Christ had submitted to circumcision the initiatory ordinance of the Mosaic dispensation it was necessary that he should submit to this, which was instituted by no less an authority, and was the introduction to his own dispensation of eternal mercy and truth. But it was necessary on another account. Our Lord represented the High Priest, and was to be the High Priest over the house of God: now as the High Priest was initiated into his office by washing and anointing, so must Christ, and hence he was baptized, washed, and anointed by the Holy Ghost. Thus he fulfilled the righteous ordinance of his initiation into the office of High Priest, and thus was prepared to make an atonement for the "sins of mankind." For so it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness; i.e., to own every divine institution, and so to show my readiness to comply with all God's righteous precepts, and to justify God and approve his counsel (Luke vii. 29), and celebrate his wisdom in sending thee to prepare his and my way, by calling men to repentance, and by so doing to fit them for the blessings of my kingdom and the avoiding of the wrath to come. So the Apostolic Constitutions (lib. 7. Ch. xxii.) say that Christ was baptized, "not that he needed any purgation, but to testify the truth of St. John's baptism, and be an example to us." - Whitby.

All righteousness. "There was no particular precept in the Old Testament requiring this, but he chose to give the sanction of his example to the baptism of John, as to a divine ordinance. The phrase "all righteousness" here is the same as a righteous institution or appointment. Jesus had no sin. But he was about to enter on his great work. It was proper that he should be set apart by his forerunner, and show his connection with him, and give his approbation to what John had done. Also, he was baptized that occasion might be taken, at the commencement of his work, for God publicly to declare his approbation of him and his solemn appointment to the office of the Messiah." - Barnes.

All the above authorities are agreed on this question of baptism. Further, it may be remarked that it was by this act of obedience that Jesus was made manifest to Israel. He then "came by water." (1 John v. 6.) And then it was that the spirit of God descended upon him, and a voice from heaven was heard saying, "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased." It was thus made the occasion of his anointing or Christing, and moreover, by that same act of obedience he left an example that all believers in him should follow in his steps, and "be baptized into his name."

"I knew him not," (says John) "but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost. And I saw and bare record that this is the son of God." (John i. 31-34.)

In the article before alluded to in the Christadelphian, the writer, while admitting that it was necessary for Jesus to undergo this rite (of baptism), and that otherwise he would not have fulfilled all righteousness, or in other words would have sinned, contends that, inasmuch as the baptism of John had relation to sin, and as a consequence to death also, which is the wages of sin; that there must have been some reason for (Jesus) having to undergo a ceremony which had relation to sin and death. He then asks, "What could that (reason) be but the sentence of death inherited from Adam?" He then goes on to say that the Jews generally in submitting to the baptism of John practically confessed that they were worthy of death on account of their iniquities; and that Jesus in going through the same ceremony thereby acknowledged that

he was under sentence of death on account of the sin of the first man. Unable himself to see any other reason why Jesus submitted to the ceremony than the one he suggests, he rather hastily comes to the conclusion that none other can be given! The fallacy of this is apparent. Surely it is possible there may be another and even more satisfactory reason which has escaped the notice of the writer above referred to!

Undoubtedly there was a reason, and a very cogent one, too, why Jesus submitted to be immersed by John, and what that reason was has been shown from the Lord's own words, in answer to the Baptist who at first forbade him. Those words of his do not contain the slightest hint that he believed himself to be under sentence of death on account of Adam's sin. Neither is there a tittle of evidence to prove that such an idea existed in the mind of John. On the contrary, the Baptist is surprised that the Lord should come to him for such a purpose. "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" (Matt. iii. 14.) Throughout his article the writer takes not the slightest notice of that most important fact, that Jesus was begotten by the Almighty, and consequently, not being in the loins of Adam when he transgressed, was not under sentence of death on account of the sin of the first man. This consideration is fatal to his argument, and shows it to be based on a fallacy and an assumption.

Would it not have been more logical on the part of the writer in the Christadelphian if he had first brought forward some proof that Jesus was under sentence of death on account of the sin of the first man, instead of trying to establish the point at issue by simply drawing an inference? But there was evidently no proof at hand, so he first enquires what the reason could be that Jesus was baptized but the one he suggests, and then assumes that Jesus acknowledged it by submitting to the ceremony! The facts of the case admit of a very different explanation, as already shown. It by no means follows because the Jews generally in submitting to the Baptism of John practically confessed that they were worthy of death on account of their iniquities, that Jesus, in going through the same ceremony, thereby acknowledged that he was under a like condemnation. At best it is but an inference, and on the face of it looks very like an attempt to find support for a preconceived theory, and unless some evidence of a positive kind can be found to prove that Jesus was under condemnation to death in Adam, the entire argument based on his Baptism falls to the ground as untenable.

The argument in opposition to the condemnation theory may be thus summarized. Jesus was baptized,

1st, To fulfil all righteousness.

2nd, To be made manifest to Israel.

3rd, To prefigure his death and resurrection.

4th, To leave an example that we should follow in his steps.

The circumcision of Jesus admits of a similar explanation. It was a sign or token of the Covenant which God made with Abraham, by which every man child was commanded to be circumcised on the eighth day. And the neglect of this peculiar rite was held by the law to be a breach of the covenant, which would result in the cutting off of that soul from Israel. "This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you and thy seed after thee: Every man child among you shall he circumcised. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations. And the uncircumcised man child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people: he hath broken my covenant." (Gen. xvii. 10, 12, 14.) In this particular Jesus was precisely in the same position as any other male child in Israel. The rigid observance of this legal ceremony was a necessity, and in harmony with this we find it recorded in Luke ii. 21, 27, that "the parents brought in the child Jesus to do for him after the custom of the law." Again, like the Baptism, to which Jesus submitted, the ceremony was typical of a future cutting off and blood shedding, as well as a sign of circumcision of the heart. Paul's teaching is that all circumcised persons were debtors to do the whole law, (Gal. v. 3,) and that the law cursed them if they failed even in one point. Jesus discharged this debt to the full, and though cursed by the law because he was hanged on a tree, he was not cursed by that law as a transgressor, for he was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." (Phi. ii. 8.) The writer in the Christadelphian already referred to, states (p. 428 of that magazine) that circumcision was typical of the taking away of sin, and a mode of justification which could not be for individual sin, seeing that it was performed when children were only eight days old; it must, therefore, have been on account of the condemnation inherited from Adam." This is precisely similar to the remark he makes when speaking of John's Baptism, so that, according to his argument, the sinless Jesus required to be justified twice over from the sentence of death he supposes he inherited on account of Adam's sin. And thus in both instances he assumes the point to be proved! It may be further remarked that even a criminal in being executed does not commit a breach of the law, but fulfils the law. But Jesus was not a criminal. The curse of the law was borne by him to redeem those who had broken it. In a word, he died "the just for the unjust, to bring us to God."

And this introduces to the reader the second head of remark namely,

THE CURSE OF THE LAW.

“Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” (Gal. iii. 13.) “Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law.” (Rom. iii. 19.)

That the Jews were under this law and failed to keep its requirements, and consequently came under the curse pronounced upon all such will not be disputed. They were disobedient to the command of Moses, and disobedience being synonymous with sin, and death being the wages of sin, it follows that the threatened curse involved them all in death. From this curse Paul declares Christ redeemed them, being “made a curse” for them. Here, however, it becomes necessary to discriminate between the curse pronounced upon the disobedient Jews, who were all transgressors of the law, and the curse borne by Christ, who kept the law. Inasmuch as Christ was “obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,” it is impossible that the law could condemn Him to death as a transgressor. To suppose that the curse in both instances signified death, as the result of disobedience, is not only to condemn the guiltless, but to lose sight of all distinction between obedience and disobedience, and to involve both righteous and wicked in one common destiny. How then did Jesus come under the curse of the law? The answer is, by hanging on a tree.” “He that is hanged is accused of God.” (Deut. xxi. 23.) By the particular mode of His death Jesus became an accursed one. But this was no act of transgression on His part. To say that He thereby broke or “infringed” the law is to contradict the scripture, and to affirm, in direct opposition to the Apostle Paul, that Jesus was not obedient unto death. There is no enactment in the law which says: thou shalt not hang on a tree. The violation of the law consists not in hanging a man on a tree, but in allowing the body to remain all night upon the tree, and not burying it the same day. The passage in the Book of Deuteronomy reads thus - “If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be to be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day.” (De. xxi. 22, 23.) It is recorded of Joshua, in the Book which bears his name, that, The King of Ai be hanged on a tree until eventide: and as soon as the sun was down, Joshua commanded that they should take his carcase down from the tree, and cast it at the entering of the gate of the city and raise thereon a great heap of stones, that remaineth unto this day. (Josh. viii. 29.) “And afterwards Joshua smote them (the five Kings), and slew them; and hanged them on five trees: and they were hanging upon the trees until the evening: And it came to pass at the time of the going down of the sun that Joshua commanded, and they took them down off the trees, and cast them into the cave; wherein they had been hid, and laid great stones in the cave’s mouth, which remain until this very day.” (Jos. x. 26, 27.) Did Joshua “infringe” the law in hanging these kings upon trees? Surely not. On the contrary, he acted in strict conformity to the law, giving commandment that the bodies should be taken down and buried at sun-set. The fact that Joshua so disposed of criminals is proof that there was nothing unlawful in hanging a man on a tree. It was a most ignominious mode of death, and those so punished were said to be “accursed of God.” Again, the words used in Deuteronomy clearly imply that such a mode of punishment might be adopted, and, therefore, could not possibly constitute a breach of the law.

In the article in the Christadelphian on the “Mosaic Curse,” it is stated, p. 419, second paragraph, “Up to the time immediately preceding his (that is Jesus) being hanged on the cross, he had “continued in all things written in the book of the law to do them.” This implies that beyond that point of time He did not so continue. In other words he then became a transgressor! This is indeed admitted by the same writer in his book entitled “Jesus Christ and Him Crucified,” p. 67, first paragraph. His words (some of which we have italicised) are these: speaking of Jesus, he says, “Being a Jew by birth, he was ‘made under the law,’ (Gal. iv. 4) and therefore it was necessary that he should comply with the injunctions of that law. This he did in every particular except one. Consequently he came under the curse of that law! for ‘whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all,’ (Jas. ii. 10) and cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” (Gal. iii. 10.) Among the things “written in the book of the law,” it is said, “he that is hanged is accursed of God.” (Deut. xxi. 23.) This was the one item of the law which was infringed by Jesus, and, therefore, he became obnoxious to its curse, which was death. But it was necessary that such should be the case, in order to obey the will of God, that he might effect that which is expressed by the Apostle Paul, when he says, Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us, for it is written, “Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree” (Gal. iii. 13.) Now here is a mixture of truth and error in which the author not only contradicts himself, but what is far worse, contradicts the scriptures also! It is difficult to understand how Jesus could obey the will of God by infringing His law! But to return to the article in the Christadelphian. On p. 423, second paragraph, the same writer says, “We have seen how Jesus was

brought under the Mosaic Curse - namely, by a passive act commanded by God, and brought about in such a way that he was innocent of actual transgression. Here is contradiction again! This conclusion being the very opposite of the one before arrived at by the same writer, where he says: "This was the one item of the law which was infringed by Jesus, and, therefore, he became obnoxious to its curse." But what is the meaning of a passive act? It is a contradiction in terms! The author might just as well have said that Jesus in hanging on the cross was obediently disobedient, or disobediently obedient. To be passively active must be a curious condition indeed. What confusion must have existed in the mind of the writer when he penned such a phrase as this. It is "confusion worse confounded." The Jews were redeemed by the same means that the Gentiles were redeemed, namely, by the shedding of the precious blood of the Christ as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. "For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." (Rev. v. 9.)

Great stress has been laid upon the words "made a curse," as if the bare fact that Jesus was pronounced accursed in the mode of his death was the procuring cause of man's redemption! In the letter to the Galatians where those words occur, the Apostle was not writing specially about crucifixion; his main object was to combat the notion which was current among the disciples in that ecclesia that the converts from among the Gentiles must needs be circumcised and keep the law of Moses, as well as believe the gospel and be immersed. Paul argues at considerable length in order to disabuse their minds of such false teaching, bringing his arguments to a climax in the 5th chapter, in which he exhorts the disciples, saying (v. 1 to 4) "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." The law having answered the purpose for which it was instituted, was taken out of the way and was no longer to be observed, being nailed to the tree when Christ was "made a curse." As it is written, "And you being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." (Col. ii. 13, 14.) "For he (Christ) is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace: And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh." (Ephes. ii. 14 - 17.) The death which Jesus suffered was just as needful for Gentiles as for Jews, and equally redeemed both classes from the sentence of death in which all are included. Not that it was imperative for Jesus to die for the Gentiles by crucifixion, but had He not so died He could not have redeemed the Jews, and if He had not redeemed the Jews it would have been impossible for "the blessing of Abraham to come on the Gentiles through Him." It was necessary that Jesus should submit to this particular kind of death in order that the Scriptures might be fulfilled. His own words indeed prove this: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." (John iii. 14. Num. xxi. 8, 9.) "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said, signifying what death, he should die" (John xii. 32, 33.) "Then said Pilate unto them, Take ye him and judge him according to your law. The Jews therefore said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death; that the saying of Jesus might be fulfilled which he spake signifying what death he should die." (John xviii. 31, 32.) Luke also writes, "Then he said unto them, O fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me." (Luke xxiv. 24, 25, 26, 27, 44.) Again it is written in the Psalms, "For dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet." (Ps. xxii. 16.) "And they shall look upon me whom they have pierced:" (Zech. xii. 10.) To what do the predictions above quoted apply if not to crucifixion? And how could they have been fulfilled if Christ had not died upon the tree? It follows from the above arguments, based on Scripture testimony, that Jesus was in no sense a transgressor of the law of Moses; that he did not infringe it in one single point, and therefore that his life was not forfeited to the Mosaic law. And if his life was not forfeited to the Law of Moses in order to redeem the Jews, why should it be considered necessary that his life should be forfeited to the law of Eden in order to redeem the Gentiles?

In conclusion of this article it may be further remarked in reference to the matter of hanging on a tree that it applied to the dead as well as to the living. This is clear from the passage already quoted from the Book of Joshua. He smote them and slew them and hanged them on five trees. Is it not plain from this testimony that the kings mentioned were dead before they were hanged on the trees? And would it not be a monstrous absurdity to curse a dead man with death? Moreover, in this case of a living man who was a criminal accounted worthy of death, he was already under sentence to die before he was hanged on the tree, and legally speaking therefore already a dead man. To show this is to demonstrate the utter fallacy of the argument based on the idea that the curse in the case of the Jews and in the case of Christ himself was the same, namely, death.

Finally, the Mosaic law did not curse a man simply because he hung on a tree, but because of the crime he committed before he was placed there. But being found there after sentence, whether guilty or innocent, whether alive or dead, such an one was accounted cursed by the Law.

Footnote: *”The Mosaic Curse in Relation to Jesus Christ. By J. J. Andrew. London.

HAD THE LAW OF MOSES POWER TO GIVE ETERNAL LIFE?

“To the Jew who was born under the Law of Moses this question would be of the greatest moment. And now that the law has been superseded by the gospel and taken out of the way, the inquiry has by no means become deprived of all interest. We had thought that the masterly arguments of Paul had satisfactorily settled this question long since, especially to the minds of our brethren; but the recently originated discussion concerning Jesus Christ has woke up sundry topics which had hitherto lain dormant, and among them this question. In observing attentively what has been said in different quarters on this topic we are struck with the flat contradiction betwixt the Editor of the Christadelphian and Brother J. J. Andrew, of London. As both these writers are regarded by the brethren as men whose judgment it is not unsafe to follow, it is worthwhile to present what they maintain upon this question in one view. If they contradict each other it is not possible to go along with both of them, and those who will follow both must become divided, part going one way and part another. If the road to eternal life in the kingdom of God consisted of two diametrically opposite paths, this divided and contrary plan of reaching it would have nothing dangerous in it; but if the road to eternal life is one straight and narrow way, then those who seek it in any other direction will find themselves in the way that leadeth to destruction.

From “a verbatim report” kindly sent to us, it will be seen how the Editor of the Christadelphian answered the question at the head of this paper in his lecture on Friday, July the 29th. “But before I consider how these two curses converged upon the Messiah that he might bear them away, let me ask what the law was given for? Now here I will give the testimony of the word. Paul says in the 7th of Romans, at the 10th verse: “The commandment (speaking of the law) which was ordained to life I found to be unto death. Does that mean eternal life? Yes, it does; and I will prove it. I refer you to the 10th chapter of Luke, where in the 25th verse we read: “Behold, a certain lawyer stood up and tempted Jesus saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He says unto him, what is written in the law, how readest thou?” The leading features of the Law of Moses are then enumerated, and Jesus said unto him “thou hast answered right, this do and thou shall live.”

Almost anything can be made to appear true from the Scriptures if you have only sufficient unfairness to suppress part of the testimony, and sufficient courage to say “there, that is what the Scripture says on this matter.” But this mode of proof will only satisfy those who wish to prove their own preconceived ideas instead of to stand just wherever the testimony of the Word of God may place them. For the sake of the position the Editor had undertaken to maintain, it was well that he stopped, suddenly short in reading out his proof text. But for the sake of the truth itself, we think it desirable to finish what he left unread. “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself”

Now what was implied in these words? Do they prove that by keeping the Mosaic law a man could obtain eternal life? It requires more boldness than conscientiousness to say they do. To love the Lord his God after the manner herein specified would have required this lawyer to follow the great personage

whom he was addressing; it would have required him to follow the gospel which was given before the law. This is plainly seen by Matthew's narrative of the rich ruler's inquiry. "Jesus said unto him, if thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me." Short of this, that is of following Christ, there could be no perfection to the man who saw Christ and heard him preach the gospel of the kingdom.

But, says the Editor, feeling the danger of his rash assertion, but apparently wanting the necessary candour to withdraw it, "the law given was unto life, if they kept it." We think every sensible man would recognize the necessity of keeping the law before its advantages could be realized. Why emphasise the words "if they kept it?" When it is said by the Editor they could not keep it. If they could not keep it, then it was impossible to obtain that eternal life by it; therefore the offer of eternal life on such terms was simply a deception. This writer makes the Almighty frame a law for man, which man could not observe, he makes the Almighty offer man eternal life on conditions man cannot possibly fulfil; and then coolly remarks, "God has His own reason, and our wisdom is in simply seeing and accepting it." But we cannot simply see and accept that which is a manifest superfluity and a solemn mockery. God at all times calls upon His creature man to recognise the wisdom and justice of his dealing with him; but no power of affirmation, no subtlety of argument can disguise the worse than human folly of such an arrangement as the Editor of the *Christadelphian* here describes. Where is the wisdom of placing man under a law which he cannot obey? Where is the justice of requiring a man to struggle for that which it is impossible for him to obtain? A man who takes such a view of God's proceedings must lay aside all reason, and all his knowledge of equity, and goodness, and mercy; he must in a word be ignorant of the true character of God as revealed in the law and in the gospel; or else he must be without scruple in handling the word of God, where his object is to support his own views.

We may direct attention to this lecture on the Slain Lamb at a future time.

The complete opposition of Brother Andrew's conclusion to the conclusion arrived at by the Editor of the *Christadelphian*, becomes visible at a glance. In that article entitled *The Mosaic Curse* in relation to Jesus Christ, Brother Andrew writes: "It (the letter to the Galatians) forms part of an argument in which the Apostle is endeavouring to convince certain Jewish believers that salvation comes by faith and not by the works of the Mosaic Law." And further on he says, "it was impossible for any Jew to obtain eternal life by it."

The Editor and Brother Andrew are professedly writing on the same side, but their conclusions in support of what they wish to establish are subversive of each other; we judge therefore that their cause will not be much advanced by their efforts. We deeply regret that the writer of the article on the *Mosaic Curse* does not view other subjects with the same clearness and simplicity as he discerns the teaching of Paul on the law in relation to eternal life.

The Editor of the *Christadelphian* appears to have been called to account by "several" on this subject, and he answers them thus: "We admit, however, that the answer requires qualification." But if the answer has been proved by Scripture what qualification does it require? If it has not been proved by Scripture it needs not qualification, but renunciation. To pour out a flood of words only makes the matter ten times worse; because it suggests the lack of candour and moral courage needful to say "I was in error; I am sorry for it."

A man who contends that eternal life could be obtained through the observance of the Mosaic law, says, in effect, that it cannot be obtained by the faith of the gospel. He may be so dark as not to perceive, or so biased as not to admit this inference, but it is the inference drawn by Paul himself: "We are saved by faith; but the law is not of faith." This is a question about which Paul has written much, and in a style not hard to be understood. To see, indeed, the wisdom of imposing on Israel a law which no man could keep; a law which offered eternal life to those who could not possibly fulfil its requirements, must surely require a most "prolonged spiritual education," and a power more than human to "look below the surface." We leave the contemplation of such spiritual impossibilities, and turn to refresh our memories with the plain and conclusive statement of the Apostle to the Gentiles. To the Jews at Antioch Paul said: -

"But he whom God raised again, saw no corruption. Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." - Acts x. iii. 38. Now what is this but saying in other words that by the law there was no remission of sins? And if no remission of sins, then there could be no eternal life. Paul supports this view in saying that by the blood of the Mosaic atonement sins were not, and could not be, removed; but a remembrance was made again of them every year: "The blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; but has no virtue in them" to purge the conscience from dead works." To affirm, therefore, that eternal life could be had through the keeping of the law, is to say that an unpurged person - a person whose mind and conscience are unsanctified in the sight of God can put on immortality!

To continue Paul's statement in the thirteenth of Acts, verse 39: "And by Him, all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses." To the Galatians Paul wrote as follows:- "We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but **BY THE FAITH OF JESUS CHRIST**, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. For I, through the law, am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I do not frustrate the grace of God; for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is **DEAD in VAIN**." But if we hold that eternal life could have come by the law, we must also hold that righteousness could have come by it; the conclusion, therefore, is that we thereby "frustrate the grace of God."

But to Paul's mind, which even the Editor of the Christadelphian will admit, had received a more "prolonged" and "spiritual education" than his had received, it was evident that the law of Moses had not the power, if kept, to bestow eternal life; and for the sufficient reason that in no part of that law is eternal life promised as the reward for keepings it. Paul says, "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident, **FOR THE JUST SHALL LIVE BY FAITH**, and the law is not of faith."

Again, when Paul considered the eternal inheritance he confirms his previous teaching. "For if," says he, "the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise." What was this promise? The Scriptural answer is, that to Abraham, And his seed (which is Christ) should be given the land of Israel for an everlasting possession. As there can be no everlasting possession without everlasting life, it follows that such life was included in the promise. Mark, Paul says it was not by the law, but God gave it to Abraham by promise. If everlasting life was not attached by God to the keeping of the law, how could those who kept the law receive it. Paul shows us why it was not included in the law. God had placed it in the promise. Now the promise was four hundred and thirty years before the law; but the law coming after could not disannul the promise. According to Paul, whoever says that eternal life could have been obtained by the law, makes the promise of none effect.

Further, this promise is the gospel. Now the gospel is the power of God to salvation to everyone that believeth it, - to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. Therefore, to teach that eternal life might be attained through the law is to make the gospel ineffectual to salvation; it is, in fact, to declare another gospel, and to make the unrepentant declarer obnoxious to the curse denounced against both angels and men who are found guilty of it. We call upon the reader to judge whether the Editor of the Christadelphian has not by this doctrine of eternal life through the keeping of the law of Moses denied the gospel preached by Paul and Jesus.

Paul having shewn that eternal life is not by the law, next inquires, Wherefore then, serveth the law?" In answer to this question he says, "It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." He further asks, "Is the law against the promises?" "God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life (that is, eternal life), verily righteousness should have been by that law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise (of eternal life) by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ that we might be justified by faith.

To the Romans Paul wrote these words, "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." The Apostle gives the following reason for this. "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." This reason is conclusive. The law had no power to put away sin but kept it ever in remembrance, bringing it to remembrance again every year. Not so the gospel. Obedience to its commands blots out sin and remembers it against us no more for ever. No amount of obedience to the Law of Moses could clothe a man with the righteousness of God. In the case of the faithful who lived under the law; it was not the law but the promise that entitled them to eternal life. Some Jews thought the law was all sufficient; but Paul testified that it was not. "For the law made nothing perfect; but the bringing in of a better hope did, by which we draw nigh to God." Paul styles it "a carnal commandment; and the sanctuary a worldly sanctuary," by which it is suggested that the whole arrangement was temporary, not lasting. Hence, in relation to the eternal inheritance of the land of Israel, he describes it as weak and unprofitable; therefore, after fulfilling the office of a schoolmaster, it was disannulled by the commandment going before. This being accomplished, the righteousness of God without the law was manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. How God's righteousness was witnessed by the law Paul tells us in these words: the Jews had "the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law." This "form," "figure," or "appearance," was that which the Apostle elsewhere styles "the shadow." This could not bestow eternal life; it only shadowed forth that which could, and served as a schoolmaster to the Hebrew nation.

In conclusion, Paul informs us that what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God hath done in sending His Son in a likeness of sin's flesh. The Editor of the Christadelphian supposes

that “the flesh” first mentioned is human flesh. He contends that God offered eternal life in the law, but the flesh being so perverse and rebellious it was impossible for it to lay hold on it. Did not God know this? Certainly says the Editor. He could have made man differently had he chosen to do so. We venture to style this sort of talk the height of absurdity. We assert that God never commanded man to do what He knew man could not do. If the Mosaic Law was weak through such a cause, then weakness is reflected on the Maker of that law. Will any man of sense believe that God offered the reward of eternal life by a law which He Himself rendered too weak to bestow it through the nature of the creature who was also the work of His hand?

We think we have demonstrated by Paul’s aid that the law was not designed to impart eternal life. This being so, it was not through the flesh of man that it failed. The cause of its weakness lay in another direction. We would suggest that the flesh which was the ground of its weakness was the flesh offered in its sacrifices. What those sacrifices could not accomplish God did achieve by providing a sinless sin-offering in the very nature that transgressed His law in the Garden of Eden.

EXTRACT FROM ARCHBISHOP WHATELEY’S “ESSAYS ON SOME OF THE DANGERS TO CHRISTIAN FAITHS” (PAGE 229).

A STILL more important instance perhaps is the one I slightly adverted to in my last Charge, that of the 7th and 8th chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. Hardly anyone, I think, reading the whole passage continuously, without any regard to the arbitrary break at the close of the 7th chapter, would be in danger of supposing that the Apostle Paul, though speaking in the first person, is describing his own actual character, in his regenerate, sanctified state, when he describes a man “sold under sin,” - “brought into subjection to the law of sin,” - “doing the evil that he would not” - “not doing the good that he would” - and living a life of wretched contradiction to his own judgment. The contrast is so marked between this description and that which immediately follows, of “those that are in Christ Jesus” (including, no one can doubt, the apostle himself,) “who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit,” who “being spiritually-minded have life and peace,” “and through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the flesh,” - the contrast, I say, is so marked between these two descriptions, that there would be little danger of any one’s supposing they could be meant to apply to one and the same person at the same time. But the mistake, which is not unfrequently made, is the result, I conceive, of the reader being accustomed to stop at the end of the 7th chapter, and then a day after, or perhaps a week, or a month after, to begin the perusal of the 8th chapter, as if it were a distinct treatise.

The writings of the Apostle Paul, do certainly contain many difficulties; but the easiest book in the world might be made unintelligible by being studied in that manner.

In the instance now before us, you may easily, I think, point out to the learner, that in the 5th and 6th verses of the 7th chapter, the Apostle is contrasting the conditions of “those who are in the flesh,” and “bring forth fruit unto death,” and those who are in Christ, who “bring forth fruit unto God.” and that he proceeds to expand and develop that contrast more fully in what follows; describing first the person who is “under the law,” with a knowledge and approbation of what is good, and an habitual practice of what is evil; and then (from the beginning of chapter 8) the person who is “in Christ Jesus,” and “walks not after the flesh, but after the spirit.”

And that the Apostle really is describing two different, and indeed opposite characters (which those only I think will doubt, who have been early accustomed to peruse chapters as so many distinct treatises) you may easily evince to those of your hearers who are attentive and reflecting, by joining together portions of each description, and pointing out the monstrous and absurd incongruity that would result; as a proof they cannot be both applicable to the same person at the same time: as for instance - “There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit, but who do the evil they would not, and do not the good that they would - for the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death; O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death? . . . That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the spirit; for to will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good, I find not . . . So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God; but we are not in the flesh, but in the spirit; but I am carnal, sold under sin.”

I have insisted the more earnestly on the right interpretation of this passage, because the opposite interpretation goes to nullify, practically all our labours in the inculcation of moral duty. For, when any description or example is set before men, by way of pattern, we may be quite sure that this will be made the standard, and that general principles and precepts will be practically explained, and limited, and modified, in their application, according to that standard. We can never hope that our hearers, though living in sin, and only occasionally bewailing it, will really feel much shame and uneasiness, while they believe themselves to be on a level with the Apostle Paul.

The interpretation I have been censuring I have heard defended as a mode of inculcating the important lesson; if the necessity even in the most advanced Christian, of continual vigilance against the infirmities and evil tendencies of our nature, and the temptations to which he is still exposed, and which he can resist only by divine help. The lesson is true and important, and inculcated, though not in this, in several other parts of the sacred writing; as, for instance, 1 Cor. ix. 24. But we must never presume to distort the sense of any passage of Scripture for the sake of inculcating even a Scriptural truth, which was not in the intention of the writer. In the present instance, however, the Apostle's words do not, and cannot inculcate such a lesson, for he is describing, not a man vigilantly watching against the frailty of his nature, and earnestly struggling against, and by divine aid, subduing it; but, on the contrary, one who is actually "carnal, sold under sin" - brought into captivity to the law of sin and not merely tempted to do, but habitually doing "the evil that he would not." And if this be understood as the Apostle's description of himself in his Christian state, this, so far from inculcating the lesson of vigilant self-distrust and resistance to evil, would put an end to every effort of the kind as hopeless, useless, and even presumptuous.

[We are much obliged to Brother Farmer for this Extract, and shall be glad to receive more of the same stamp. - Editor.]

PRAYER IN SECRET.

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father, which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly." (Matthew vi. 6.)

The subject of prayer is both broad and deep. It is not, therefore, our present intention to speak of prayer in a general sense, but to direct our observations more particularly to that aspect of prayer presented in the words of the Lord Jesus above cited. The manner in which the Lord here speaks is that of contrast: "But thou, when thou prayest." Hypocrites, at public and ostentatious prayer, were just before the subject of His strong reprobation; and now he commands his disciples to shun these customs. If even the Pharisees had the true spirit of prayer, they had long since forgotten it. Praying with them was one of the most congenial practices of manifesting their confirmed and unbounded pride; and this was fostered and rendered more abominable by the observance of their performances on the part of the ignorant passers-by.

Christ, however, had nothing to say against prayer because it was done publicly. He himself sometimes prayed to his Father in the midst of a number of persons; but it does not appear that he did this frequently. The occasions recorded are very few on which Jesus prayed in public. He set the most marked example of his own injunction in this as indeed in all his other precepts. His general habit seems to have been to seek intercourse with the Father in the solitude of night, increased by the seclusion of the situation chosen. All night, in the solitary places among the hills round about Jerusalem, he poured out his soul to God; when no human eye saw, nor feet of the traveller disturbed the fervent flow of his burdened and compassionate heart. The devout imagination easily pictures the Redeemer of the world on his knees beneath the brilliant star-lit sky on some slops, or hid in the deep shadow of some death-like valley, his eyes blind with tears, and his heart swelling with pity for mankind, but more particularly for his own nation. No eye saw him there, save that Eye which never sleeps; and no ear heard his groans and sobs save that which is never shut against the prayers of His saints.

The need for public prayer on the part of Christ was evidently very small, from the fact of its infrequent occurrence. Still Christ is more distinguished for praying than any other Bible character, Daniel not excepted who in captivity prayed to God three times a day. This circumstance suggests the idea that strictly private communion with our Creator is a duty of far greater importance than intercourse with Him through the medium of public supplication. We would not be understood to utter a single word of disparagement against praying in the family circle, much less against praying in the church, or other

assemblies of the brethren; but we would give great prominence to habitual prayer made to God in the closet, with closed door, because we fear that this practice is not sufficiently attended to among us; that most of our praying is done in a public manner, at the meetings of the brethren.

Truly private prayer has great advantages to the offerer. It presupposes a proper frame of mind in which to approach the eternal throne. It presupposes the absence of pride, and the abounding presence of true humility. It assumes the deep felt need to apply to our heavenly Father as "the giver of every good, and of every perfect gift; of life, and breath, and all things." It is evidential of a profound sense of dependence on God, and of a continual need to ask Him to give us those things which we require, and to constantly thank Him for all that we enjoy, feeling confident that it was bestowed upon us through His kindness and tender care. The man who really feels these things to be true cannot fail to spend much time in secret prayer to God. We can hardly speak of such a man praying merely from a sense of duty to God; but the idea of solemn pleasure seems to outweigh all, and the occasions will be numerous on which such a person will find him at the foot of the throne with only God and Jesus Christ as spectators of his holy joy. Such a man will realize in the Almighty a Friend; will appreciate in a peculiar manner the saying that Abram was "the friend of God;" to whom he could come for counsel and help; and will, with singular pleasure, regard Jesus as "a friend that sticketh closer than a brother."

It is highly improbable that anyone will pray often to God in secret who does not feel strongly the desires and the needs before alluded to. He might pray, and pray much in public; pray with demonstration; but unless the affections are set on things above where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God, it seems hardly possible to come to God in secret. The motives for doing so would not exist, and private prayer is not a thing that could be long continued without motive, and that of a very strong kind. The child who desires some favour of his father never dreams of taking occasion to ask him in public. It never strikes him that any advantage is to be gained by preferring his request then. He is perfectly content to ask his father alone; his mind being fixed on two objects only, the things wished for, and upon him in whose power it is to give or to withhold. If we are God's children indeed, this will be the case with us. We shall not seek to speak to our father openly, but in secret, believing that our Father who seeth in secret will reward us openly.

If we have firm faith in God, there is no single thing which we desire that we shall not ask Him for. If we do not make our requests known to Him, it is a strong evidence that we have no belief that all things are in His power. We had better not ask at all than ask without faith. Such a demand amounts to little short of an insult. God is not to be applied to as men sometimes are, trusting to the chance of receiving what they ask for; but they are to ask in faith, believing that they shall receive. If this is persistently done we are sure the goodness of God will soon be known to the suppliant; the statement that God hears and answers prayer will soon become a conviction. We shall soon learn to approach God as a dutiful child approaches his father, in full confidence that whatsoever is good will be given us. That is a beautiful passage with which Christ rebuked the Pharisees: "What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father know how to give good gifts unto them that ask him?" And what is so decisive a test of reliance on our Creator for everything we have as habitual secret prayer?

Secret prayer to God softens and subdues the animal passions. There are no such powerful means of disciplining the whole moral man as is found in secret prayer. There we must pray for forgiveness as we forgive those who have offended against us. This is a complete remedy for cold-heartedness, ill-temper, envy, and every evil passion. In secret prayer to God we become justly ashamed of everything which we know to be contrary to His character, and are the more emboldened to make full confession and to ask for pardon.

By habitual fervent prayer the whole man becomes assimilated to God. If we love God and Christ, we cannot help but imitate all we see in them as far as lies in our power. All persons loved by us are even insensibly imitated by us. And no man can long come unto God in his closet unless he loves God, therefore we may infer that those who best reflect the character of the Divine Being spend the most time earnestly and joyfully in secluded intercourse with Him. It is an inalienable principle of our nature that the object which we love most receives the greatest share of our thoughts and attention. We do not try to make a display of our love, and yet it is so displayed as to be seen by all around. It must be thus with regard to God and Christ, otherwise we are giving false names to our actions; our devotion is a lifeless performance. In this matter the trite saying that "actions speak louder than words," finds a striking exemplification. Secret prayer appears to be one sign of conversion. The Lord sent Ananias to inquire for Paul, saying, "Behold, he prayeth." And as regards the power of prayer, what has it not achieved? It has changed an angry brother into a friend; to wit, Jacob and Esau; it has turned the counsel of the wise into

foolishness, as in the case of Ahitophel and David; it has raised the dead to life; it has shut up the heavens, and even stopped the sun in his course.

We intend to consider the subject of prayer from other points of view in our next issue. In the meantime let us all and every one draw near to God more frequently in retirement, imploring Him to succeed his truth in every place, and give us individually knowledge, and wisdom, and strength to fight the good fight of faith.

EDITOR.

“QUESTIONS AND QUESTIONS” CONSIDERED.

THE eighty-five questions given in the October Christadelphian are, by the author of them, based on a proposition placed at their commencement. This proposition professes to fairly set forth the doctrine to which the author of the eighty-five questions is opposed. But the proposition is not correct. It shews that the writer of it does not yet understand the question at issue, or if he does, he is not disposed to set it before his readers in its proper light. We have nowhere taught that Jesus, if He had so chosen, might have avoided death, or even refused to die upon the cross, and entered into eternal life alone.” We have nowhere taught that “the penalty incurred by Adam was eternal death. What we have taught is this: Had the Father placed Jesus on probation without regard to His brethren, there does not appear to be any good reason why, at the end of it, He might not have claimed immortality without death, just as the first Adam might have claimed it without dying if he had not sinned. And as regards eternal death, we have said that death must have been eternal, except for a redeemer. This is precisely what the editor of the Christadelphian has himself stated. God’s condemnation would have destroyed them for ever, no new circumstance intervening. Ambassador, March, 1869, p. 84.

With a false proposition to begin with, it is to be expected that many of the questions arising out of it would not be such as to elicit the truth, but rather such as would assume that which is false to be true. Whoever will study the eighty-five questions will find this to be the fact. Fifty-nine of these questions hinge in a direct manner on the idea that “sinful flush” is a scriptural phrase. This is very blameable; for the editor of the Christadelphian knows very well that “sinful flesh” is not scriptural. He has himself distinctly repeated that there is no such thing as sin pervading the physical organisation. Therefore every time he affirms the doctrine that human flesh is sinful, or full of sin, he stultifies himself, and shews that he is a blind guide as regards the way to the truth of this matter. If there is no such thing as “sinful flesh” what becomes of these fifty-nine questions? They are like the mock rows of books sometimes seen in libraries, they occupy space, but contain nothing, and those who gaze upon them, ignorant of their emptiness are deceived, fancying that they are covers to deep wells of wisdom and knowledge. But the man who exhibits a counterfeit is responsible in a great measure for the mischief it causes.

It is not necessary to reprint these fifty-nine questions, nor even to particularize them. The observant reader will recognise them at first reading. We say again that “sinful flesh” is not the form of words used by Paul in Romans viii. 3, and that no such expression is to be found in the scriptures. Homoiomati sarkos hamartias is a form or likeness of sin’s flesh. Every reader of the New Testament knows that sin is spoken of as though it were a living being, a master. Such phrases as “ye were servants to sin;” “wages of sin;” shew this. Sin is therefore spoken of as a possessor of men, and “sin’s flesh” is flesh which belongs to sin. The editor of the Christadelphian has plainly stated that Adam’s sin did not at all change the nature of his flesh. He, supposing a friend held that it did, said that the evidence and presumption lay all the other way. Therefore, unless Adam’s flesh were sinful before sin entered into the world, the editor is again found to be in flat contradiction to himself. It is impossible for him to escape from this because, as we have shewn, he says there is no such thing as sin pervading the physical organisation. In view of these contrary assertions, is it not quite safe to infer that the editor does not yet understand himself, or the subject he has undertaken to expound? If a Swiss guide were known to be so ignorant of the Alpine tracks, who could be persuaded to place themselves in his charge?! The first journey would find the blind guide and his party dead at the bottom of some frightful ravine.

We ask attention now to question 15. The editor wants to know “how came it that those sacrifices never could take away sins?” This question cannot be the result of “a prolonged spiritual education.” It is anything but indicative of an eye that can see “below the surface of things.” If the reader will not feel his judgment insulted, we venture to give the following answer: It was not a bull or a goat that sinned in the Garden of Eden. Therefore a bull or a goat could not put away sin. It was a man that sinned and a man

only could put away sin. The same nature which sinned being tempted, must be tempted and be without sin. This was the man Christ Jesus. When the sins of the world were laid on Him He bore them away by the sacrifice of Himself. It is not the manner of putting sin upon the victim that removes or pardons the sin, it is the nature and character of the victim on whom the sin is laid. To lay sin on a sinner would be as useless as to lay it on a bull or a goat. Christ offered Himself without spot to God. Is any son of Adam without spot? Is he not stained with the death-spot of Adam's transgression?

The sapience of our editor's "prolonged spiritual education" is further revealed by question 29. "How do you understand Paul's statement that when He (Jesus) died, He died unto sin once. He did not die unto a sin-offering, but in making Himself a sin-offering He died unto sin."

We understand Paul as the last line of the editor points out. Jesus died unto, or for sin, in making Himself a sin-offering. We had not gone so far "below the surface of things" as to suspect that Jesus died unto a sin-offering." That which appears on the surface of Isaiah had led us to conclude that Messiah was made an offering for sin by God laying our sins on him. The types had also suggested the same thing to our mind, inasmuch as the sins of Israel were laid on them, thereby constituting them sin-offerings. And inasmuch as every one of those typical offerings was perfectly clean before sins were laid on it, it appeared to us reasonable that the antitype must be perfectly clean likewise before sins were laid on it. To the mind of the editor, however, it appears exactly the reverse, he says, the types were wholly unclean. We have placed this with his other unproved and unprovable assertions.

If the reader will compare question 34 with Brother Andrew's statement he will find one destructive of the other. That Jesus was made a curse, though He never broke the law," is taught by Brother Roberts while Brother Andrew holds that Jesus "infringed the law in one point, and thus He became obnoxious to its curse, and was guilty of all. So long as the Philistines will thus go on killing one another, there will be all the less to do for David and Jonathan. But it is impossible to witness this mutual slaughter without feelings of sorrow.

At the close of question 34, Brother Roberts says "it was necessary that Jesus should come under the Mosaic curse though guiltless:" Then in the next question he inquires, "If so was it not equally necessary that He should come personally under the operation of the Adamic curse, in order to redeem those who were under it?" To this we answer it was, and as He must be guiltless of the Mosaic, though He came under it, so He must also be guiltless of the Adamic. Brother Roberts allows that Jesus while bearing the Mosaic curse must be guiltless, and yet contends that to bear the Adamic He must be guilty! If Jesus was guiltless of the Mosaic curse, how does Bro. Roberts make it appear that He came into the world under, or between two curses, one the Eden the other the Mosaic? The truth of the matter is simple enough. In paying down His life Jesus bore the Adamic curse which was death, and in paying it down on the cross He came under the Mosaic, which accounted such a death an accursed death.

In question 44 Brother Roberts says, "God does not hold us individually responsible for Adam's offence." What does this mean? Are not those responsible who sin, or who inherit the consequences of the sin of another? Paul says they are. Because of Adam's sin all were dead; that is why one died for all. But immediately after saving "God does not hold us responsible for Adam's offence," the editor says "We inherit the effects." What are the effects? Is not death one of the effects? And why do we inherit, or rather, "how can we inherit the effects" and be free from the responsibility? Sensible people will see that the editor is in strange confusion here. Then instead of lying still until somebody comes to his assistance, like a drunken man in the mud, he makes another plunge and completely suffocates himself. "We inherit the effects," he says, "but could have been redeemed from them by obedience, if that had been possible"!!

That is to say, we could if we could, but as we could not we could not! We trust, that if this meets the editor's deeply penetrating eye, he will exercise compassion, and consider the difference that necessarily exists between those who are "carnal" and those who are "spiritual!" Brethren, behold, "the Socratic method."

- EDITOR.

(To be continued.)

DID JESUS EAT AND DRINK THE EMBLEMS OF HIS OWN FLESH AND BLOOD?

This question is much more easy to ask than to answer in a satisfactory manner. Whether we reply in the affirmative or in the negative, proof should be given, otherwise the answer leaves the mind unsatisfied. Hundreds of persons who read the accounts of the "last supper" given by the three evangelists, think that

the eating of the bread and the drinking of the cup was the keeping of the Passover by Jesus and His disciples. We hardly need say that this is an erroneous impression arising from inattention to what is repeated several times in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, as to the proper mode of observing the Passover. The food eaten at the Passover was bread and flesh, and bitter herbs; the bread was unleavened. No mention is made of wine, nor any other kind of drink, and the Israelites were forbidden to use any water in the preparation of the lamb or kid. But the food eaten at "the last supper" was simply bread and wine. This is sufficient to prove that "the breaking of bread" was not the Jewish Passover.

It is not our object at this time to speak of the Passover in its details, but only to make such allusions to it as may appear needful for the better understanding of our remarks on "the breaking of bread." Of this ordinance John makes no positive mention. The writers who treat of it distinctly, are Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul. In turning to their testimony it will be instructive to notice what they do not say, as well as what they do say. "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, the disciples came to Jesus, saying unto Him, Where wilt Thou that we prepare for Thee to eat the Passover? And He said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the Passover at thy house with my disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the Passover. Now when the even was come, He sat down with the twelve. And as they did eat, He said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me." - Matthew xxvi. 17-21.

Thus far Matthew speaks exclusively of the Jewish Passover. Whether this Passover was kept the day before, in anticipation of the feast to be held on the following day by the Israelitish nation, or whether the Passover was that year kept both on Thursday and Friday, as some writers think, we shall not now attempt to determine. The point we wish just now to point to is that Jesus gave commandment to His disciples to make ready the Passover, without saying a word about anything else, and that he sat down to eat it with them. Of course He would keep it as prescribed by Moses. It was customary for all at the table to help themselves from the same dish. Harmer says the Jews to this day make a kind of thick sauce to represent the clay which they worked in Egypt. It is not improbable that the man at whose house the feast was held was one of Christ's disciples.

Now Matthew says: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave to His disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body. And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins. But I say unto you I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

This bread was undoubtedly unleavened, for at that season the Jews were forbidden to have leavened bread in their dwellings. But this unleavened bread does not seem to have any importance in regard to what is commonly called the Eucharist. Paul, for instance, in enjoining the Corinthians to keep the ordinance as he had "received of the Lord" does not specify that the bread is to be leavened or unleavened; though of the unleavened Passover bread he in another place makes a beautiful and instructive figure. The institution of "breaking of bread" seems to have been established immediately after the Passover had been eaten; that is to say, as soon as the lamb had been consumed, and while bread remained on the table. Of the Passover Jesus did undoubtedly eat with His disciples; but Matthew does not say that He partook of the bread and wine which represented His body and His blood. As far then as Matthew goes, if we abide strictly to what is written, we dare not affirm that Jesus partook of His own body symbolized by the bread, and of His own blood symbolized by the wine.

It may, however, be said that the words "henceforth I will not drink of the fruit of the vine" implies that Jesus drank of it then. Be this as it may, no allusion is here made to the bread. And the word "henceforth" is hardly strong enough to be taken as proof that Jesus Himself drank. It may be that He only intended to say that after this time until such a time I will not drink, without meaning that He drunk then. We cannot regard the word "henceforth" as conclusive evidence that Jesus partook with His disciples. The common idea that this supper was a meal may render it somewhat less easy to look upon Jesus blessing and distributing it, but not eating and drinking himself. But that "the breaking of bread" ought not to be looked upon at all in the light of a meal to satisfy the natural appetite, is plain from Paul's rebuke of the Corinthians "What, have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" The breaking of bread is a sign of spiritual participation with Christ.

Mark describes the last Passover substantially the same as Matthew, but not exactly in the same words: "And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the Passover, His disciples said unto Him, Where wilt Thou that we go and prepare, that Thou mayest eat the Passover? And He sendeth forth two of His disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water; follow him, and wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the good man of the house, The Master saith,

Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat the Passover with my disciples? And he will shew you a large upper room, furnished and prepared, there make ready for us. And His disciples went forth and came into the city, and found as He had said unto them, and they made ready the Passover. And in the evening He cometh with the twelve. And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, one of you which eateth with me shall betray me. And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat, this is my body. And He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And He said unto them, this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God." - Mark, xiv. 12-25.

In this we have several interesting particulars omitted by Matthew; but both writers very clearly shew that "the breaking of bread" in commemoration of Christ's death did not take place till after the Passover had been disposed of; and both are equally silent as to Jesus himself partaking of the bread and wine. It would seem that Judas did not break bread; but arose and went away as soon as Jesus exposed him by saying, "It is one of the twelve that dippeth with me in the dish;" that is while they were eating the Passover. He had previously bargained with the priests, and now being unexpectedly unmasked, he rushed off to inform them that no time was to be lost, and quickly returned with a band of soldiers.

The account of the Passover given by Luke is so nearly in the language of Mark that it need not be fully transcribed. We learn from it that Peter and John were the two disciples sent to prepare the feast. This fact is not brought out either by Mark or Matthew. Of the cup Luke writes: "And He took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves, for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." Then Luke repeats the ceremony beginning with the bread. "This is my body, which is given for you." And of the cup, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you." The words "I will not drink" scarcely leave room to conjecture that Jesus drank with His disciples. And the other words also, "divide it amongst yourselves," would indicate that the wine was intended exclusively for the twelve. A like import seems to attach to the saying concerning the bread: "This is my body which is given for you," "and this is my blood which is shed for you." As much as to say, I now appoint this ordinance to be kept by you in remembrance of me, it is not for me, but for you. My body is not broken for me, my blood is not shed for me, but for you, it is therefore not for me to eat and drink, but for you.

It is clear enough from several passages that the disciples did not then understand the meaning of the newly appointed institution. They were ignorant of the necessity for the death of Jesus, and did not know that he should rise from the dead. It would then only be after their minds had been enlightened by the occurrence of the facts that they would understand the intention of the breaking of bread. Besides the ordinance was appointed specially to keep Jesus in their remembrance - "this do in remembrance of me." While Jesus was present there could be no remembrance, so that though appointed during His life it was only after His death and departure that the disciples would fully realize the significance of it.

The remark that John had made no distinct mention of the Passover, nor of "the breaking of bread" subsequently established, will be seen to be correct by reference to the narrative of a supper between Jesus and his disciples, in the thirteenth chapter. "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen, but that the scripture may be fulfilled, he that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me. Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. Then the disciples looked one on another doubting of whom He spake. Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of His disciples, whom Jesus loved. Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him that he should ask who it should be of whom He spake. He then lying * (see footnote) on Jesus' breast saith unto Him, Lord, who is it? Jesus answered, he it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when He had dipped the sop, He gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon." It will be noticed that all this was done secretly. There was no asking all round, "Is it I?" as on Passover night. And the text says, "Now no man at the table knew for what intent He spake to him. For some of them thought because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of against the feast." That was the feast of the Passover, a plain proof that the supper John was speaking of was before the Passover. On this occasion, as well as on Passover night, Jesus warned Peter that he should deny Him. It should seem that Jesus knew perfectly what Judas was plotting in his heart; and the sudden revelation of this treason not to the whole of the guests present, but only to John and Peter, caused him to complete the murderous sale of his Master. "He then," says the beloved disciple, "went immediately out, and it was night."

The next and last history of the supper is that by Paul, in 1st Corinthians, xi.: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when

he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come." We should think if the Lord Himself ate and drank, the apostle would in this, the only place he describes the ceremony, have mentioned it. But like the three preceding historians, he is silent on that point, while, like them also, he emphatically specifies that the eating and drinking were for the disciples, "This is my body which is broken for you."

In 1st Corinthians, and fifth chapter, Paul teaches that the slaying of Christ was the killing of the Christian Passover: "For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." The eating of this Passover was indicative that the eaters were members, in a spiritual sense, of Christ's flesh and of His bones; that they were taken out of His side after the pattern of the first bride; and that they are at a future time to be presented to Christ in marriage, when they will be made literally like Him. All this would appear to signify the need on their part only to eat the Passover, that is, His body. He is not to be made like them; they are to be made like Him. He was made like them in His first appearance in the world: they eat and drink of Him now in sign of their present mental and moral likeness, and also of their future physical assimilation to His nature, that is, the divine. We do not at present gather from these considerations that it was imperative for Jesus to eat the bread. If our eating of it signifies that we eat of His body, had He eat of it would not that be equivalent to eating His own body? And we are at a loss for a reason why Jesus should eat symbolically of His own flesh; He said to the disciples: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." But how this could apply to himself is not easy to see.

As regards the Jewish Passover, it may be alleged that that was prophetic, or typical of Christ's death, and assumed that as Christ ate of it, He might in like manner eat of the supper which typified the same event. But it is not quite correct to say that the supper was established as a type of the death of Christ. It would be better to describe it as a memorial of His death, for He evidently designed it to bring His death to remembrance. A type foreshadows an event, a memorial refers back to it. The Jewish paschal lamb must be eaten by Jesus, for He was a Jew; if for no other reason than to bring to memory thereby the grand deliverance of the nation from Egypt. If, however, it could be confidently affirmed that Jesus ate and drank of His own supper, the sense in which he did so could not be altogether the same as that intended for the disciples then and since. It could only, we think, be in a typical sense, foreshadowing His death by violence, not as partaking of His own flesh and blood. This latter is now, and until He come, the import of the supper; and during all this time He abstains from the fruit of the vine - performing the vow of a Nazarite unto God. Still even of this typical eating we fail to see any proof. But in drinking the wine new in the kingdom of God with His resurrected and glorified brethren, it will be a glad memorial, "a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined," it will be a joyous feast; the saints will shout for joy; the children of Zion will be joyful in their King; a grand celebration after two thousand years of the slaying of the Lamb of God, and the sprinkling of their hearts, by faith, with the blood thereof, delivering them from the vengeance of an eternal grave.

EDITOR.

Footnote: * At meals they reclined on couches on the left elbow, feet from the table.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM. - Brethren from Nottingham, Leicester, and Maldon have lately visited this town in the interests of the Truth, and are able to report that the statement made that the views concerning the Christ as propounded by Brethren Handley and Turney have not been "vanquished." On the contrary there are thirty who have embraced them, and a still larger number who are carefully examining them.

DEAL. - Sister Risien reports the Immersion of Sister Reynolds' daughter who was recently immersed by Brother David Brown, after making a highly satisfactory confession of her faith. The ministrations of Bro. D B. have been of great service in this town, and are much appreciated by those in the Truth there. All in this Ecclesia have embraced the new views without exception.

DEVONPORT. - Brother Dashper writes, "What a glorious Truth, dear Bro, a Christ of our flesh and blood, but uncondemned and therefore mighty to save. I think I may say all here are satisfied on this important point."

GLASGOW. - Brother Gray writes: "There are now ten of us who meet on the basis of an uncondemned Christ, and greatly rejoice in that glorious Truth. We have been greatly strengthened by the reading of Bro. Turney's published lecture, it clearly shows the fallacy of our opponents, especially in reference to the Types. We think it well calculated to enlighten the minds of many on the points in dispute."

LONDON. - Brother Watts writes: It has been determined, at my request, to invite Bro. Handley to London, to hear him explain his so-called 'Heresy.' He is to discuss with Bro. J. J. Andrew in quarter-hour speeches for one or two nights and then each is to submit to be questioned. Brother Andrew to commence each night. After that Bro. Andrew is to be allowed to go down to Maldon, and before the Ecclesia there carry out the same course of procedure. I can reckon on ten or twelve who have thoroughly made up their minds about the subject, and see with us an uncondemned Christ in the teaching of the Word, and will I think be prepared to go with him outside the camp and bear the reproach if necessary. One of them goes so far as to say that he cannot fellowship those who eat of the Christ, believing Him to **be condemned, and he will remain outside until some decided step is taken.**"

LIVERPOOL - Brother Ellis, in a letter to Bro. Turney, says: "I am happy to say that I am still increasing in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, so that you may still rejoice with me in thanking our heavenly Father for blessing us with a more perfect knowledge of Himself. I have seen your lecture and read it once. You must not get vain when I tell you I consider it a master-piece, and quite exhaustive. I suppose you have got the Christadelphian, and noticed the new position taken by Bro. Roberts and others. 'The law of Moses could give eternal life to one already condemned in Adam.' This no doubt is the logical sequence of the idea that the Son of God was more the son of Adam than Son of God." Brother Ellis is quite willing to discuss with Bro. Roberts.

LEICESTER. - Misrepresentation has been rife in this quarter as in others. Bro. Lester informs us that there are twelve in that town who have laid hold of the new development of Truth concerning the Christ.

MALDON. - In this town there are only six who have not as yet embraced the Truth as we now understand it.

MUMBLES. - Brother Clements, writing to the editor, says: "I am heartily glad that you, though like myself much persecuted for conscience sake, have consented to publish a monthly periodical. From what I know of you I do not think its pages will ever be used to speak evil of innocent brethren, and then refuse them an opportunity of justifying themselves."

NOTTINGHAM. - The Sunday evening lectures in this place continue to be extremely well attended, the number of attentive listeners increasing. The subjects of the last four lectures delivered in the Synagogue have been as under - "The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven," where, when and how used. - Bro Watts' "The Faith and Hope of a converted Jew." - Bro. C. Handley, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again." - Bro. C. Handley, "Who says the Soul is immortal? What is the Soul" - Bro. Hayes. There are some cases of Immersion pending, and several interested enquirers. A tea meeting was held on the 2nd inst., at which several short speeches were made by the Brethren present, two of whom were visitors from a distance. A pleasant, and it is hoped not an unprofitable, evening was spent. The seceders from this Ecclesia on the subject of the present controversy number only thirty-five. More than a hundred remain meeting together at the Synagogue, and rejoicing in the further acquisition of knowledge concerning the Christ.

STOKE, SOUTH DEVON. - Brother Moore writes: "I do most heartily endorse the view concerning the Sacrifice of Christ set forth in Bro. Turners published lecture. I have given the subject a thorough searching, and I am convinced that Bro Turney is correct. The members of the Ecclesia here are giving the subject a careful examination. This is as it ought to be."

STOURBRIDGE. - It had been incorrectly stated that fifteen had separate themselves from this Ecclesia on the subject of the present controversy. We are happy to inform our readers that the number of seceders is only nine.

Letters to the Editor, Signs of the Times, and other interesting matter excluded for want of space, will appear in the next Number.