

# The Christadelphian Lamp

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

Vol. 1.

MAY, 1874

No. 7.

---

## CONTENTS

Page 2	A Treatise on the Two Sons of God (Continued)	Editor
Page 8	The First and Second Adams	Brother John Butler
Page 10	The Breaking of Bread	Editor
Page 12	Remarks on Brother W.H.Hacking’s Letter	Editor
Page 13	Charity	G.L.
Page 14	Sunday Morning at The Christadelphian Synagogue	Brother S.G.Hayes
Page 16	The Anti-typical Aspects of The Law of Jealousy	Bro. John Campbell
Page 17	Obadiah and His Single Chapter	Editor
Page 20	Reference Tablet No. 4	W
Page 21	Psalms XXIX - Poem	D.B.
Page 22	Matthew XXVII.9 - Extract	F.H.W.
Page 23	On the Responsibility of Men for Errors Arising from Prejudice	Eclectic
Page 25	Intelligence	

-----

“The gospel of John is remarkable for its wide difference in style from the other three; and one of its peculiarities is the frequency with which we are told that Jesus did not His own will but the will of Him that sent Him. There is one observation on this which every thoughtful reader will, probably, make for himself. The statement seems to imply very clearly that Jesus had a will of His own, and that that will would, if followed out, have been contrary to the will of God. What we mean by God’s will is the law which God gave to Jesus for His guidance. It is written that “He heard and learned of the Father.” By the will of Jesus we mean His natural inclinations as a man. It is recorded that He was tempted in all things like His brethren; and that He suffered, being tempted.

The will of the flesh unrestrained is at variance with the will of God. When checked and guided by the Divine mind, man reflects his Maker. It had been quite as easy for God to constitute man perfect in the sense of creating him without those propensities and desires which lead him to think and act contrary to God’s will. But it pleased the Almighty so to frame man, that he might have some share in the work and honour of his own exaltation. This exaltation is primarily the work of God, and without the primary work no secondary work of man could avail anything; but, in co-operation, the great and glorious end is achieved.”

-----

**“Prove all things;  
hold fast that which is good.”**

**1 Thessalonians 5:21**

# A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD, (Continued from April, Page 7)

## ADAM AND JESUS.

### CHAPTER III. - Adam and Jesus. - Sin and Disobedience. - Love and Death. - The Heir of all things.

These are the two sons of God in a particular manner; the one, formed direct from the dust of the earth, the other, begotten by Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary.

It is unsafe to strain the scriptures for types and correspondences, such procedure is suggestive of too great an eagerness to sustain some preconceived idea. But to pass over those persons and things, declared by the inspired writers of the New Testament to be types and shadows, would be to neglect a valuable portion intended for our instruction.

The Apostle Paul has definitely stated that Adam was a figure of Christ, "The figure of Him that was to come." - Ro. v., 14. Now a figure, as Paul remarks in another place, is not to be taken as "the very image of the thing;" we must not, therefore, look for everything in Adam which we see in Christ, nor for everything in Christ which we see in Adam. This is a little study for the exercise of our discrimination. The object to be aimed at is to regard Adam in his typical capacity as nearly as Paul viewed him as possible. One essential to the attainment of this end is, in our opinion, to keep close to the facts concerning both characters. Inference is not altogether inadmissible in the case; but if we can seize upon the facts themselves, or even the principal part of them and look at them in a clear light, this will be less open to objection than inference, however well-grounded it may appear to be.

Adam is presented to us in two phases. His life is divided into two grand periods; the first, the period of innocence; the second, the period of guilt. We might have said three instead of two; the third being that period of time after the Almighty had pardoned his sin and covered him with the "coat of skins."

We now enquire. In which of these did Adam represent Jesus, - in all three or in two of the three, and if not, in which of the three? Luke styles Adam the son of God. This agrees with what Moses says, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." This "living soul" was the first human son of God, of whom the Bible furnishes an account. The phrase "son of God," seems to imply a resemblance to God; and Adam is declared to have been made after the likeness and image of his Creator.

Thus far the parallel between the two sons of God, that is to say, betwixt the testimony concerning them is sufficiently plain. Jesus was the Son of God; and the scripture saith He was the express image of His Father's person. Miraculous powers do not constitute Jesus the Son of the Deity. He possessed none of these before His baptism; and it is needless to remark that He obeyed His Father's will as perfectly before as afterwards. We are viewing Adam and Jesus, for the present, simply in the relation of type and antitype, as sons of God; and thus far it appears the resemblance is very close. Both receive their life and law direct from the Deity. There is no difference in character; nor any difference in nature. Adam, in the period during which we are now considering him, displayed the glory of his heavenly Father; he obeyed his will; he was endowed with his wisdom; he was a living, tangible, reflex of God. But though a created, he was not a begotten son; the reason for this difference will appear as we proceed.

The gospel of John is remarkable for its wide difference in style from the other three; and one of its peculiarities is the frequency with which we are told that Jesus did not His own will but the will of Him that sent Him. There is one observation on this which every thoughtful reader will, probably, make for himself. The statement seems to imply very clearly that Jesus had a will of His own, and that that will would, if followed out, have been contrary to the will of God. What we mean by God's will is the law which God gave to Jesus for His guidance. It is written that "He heard and learned of the Father." By the will of Jesus we mean His natural inclinations as a man. It is recorded that He was tempted in all things like His brethren; and that He suffered, being tempted.

The will of the flesh unrestrained is at variance with the will of God. When checked and guided by the Divine mind, man reflects his Maker. It had been quite as easy for God to constitute man perfect in the sense of creating him without those propensities and desires which lead him to think and act contrary to God's will. But it pleased the Almighty so to frame man, that he might have some share in the work and honour of his own exaltation. This exaltation is primarily the work of God, and without the primary work no secondary work of man could avail anything; but, in co-operation, the great and glorious end is

achieved. It were as unreasonable to overlook or ignore this secondary work as it were sinful and blasphemous to disregard the primary work. On this principle the glory of God is manifest, and also the glory of man. The glory of God is seen in the unspeakable honour and wisdom and riches He deigns to bestow upon the creature, man; the glory of man is seen in his obedience to God.

As regards this matter of will and law, Adam was plainly a figure of Jesus. It is contrary to reason, and contrary to scripture also, to regard the moral condition of Adam and the moral condition of Jesus as being like that generally believed to obtain among the angels. The very constitution of Adam and the purpose of the Most High leave us no doubt that his lot under law was a scene of sharp trial. There must have been times when Adam felt himself much troubled and tempted. He would be sometimes well within the limit, at others dangerously close to it. This is the experience of all men in relation to moral law; whether it be the law of their nature arising out of the moral powers which distinguish them from the beasts, or whether it be a law received from God. Adam was no exception to "every man who when he is tempted is drawn away of his own lusts." To suppose otherwise would be to destroy the main part of God's scheme, and reduce law and obedience to a mockery.

### **SIN AND DISOBEDIENCE.**

The possibility of rendering obedience to Divine law is established from the beginning. It is just as possible for man to obey God now as it was for our first parents to obey Him in the Garden of Eden. The constitution of man is precisely the same now as then; he has no desires now which he had not then, that is to say, he has not lost any of his old or first faculties, neither has he acquired any new ones. If any of his natural appetites, being aroused, are found too strong for him that is clearly no crime, unless he has the means of altogether avoiding the temptation. If man cannot obey, the law of-obedience is a nullity.

A mistake is sometimes made in supposing all sin to be alike. Sins of ignorance are not acts of disobedience; they do not occur from a criminal fault on man's part. A Jew, for example, might walk over a grave and thereby become legally defiled, but it would be wrong to esteem that a criminal act. If, after the Jew had been made aware of his position, he refused to comply with the law of purification, he would then be a disobedient person. To set the heinousness of sin in a strong light, the Almighty ordained sacrifices for sins of ignorance, but He did not regard such sins as disobedience.

Sin is defined in the scriptures as "the transgression of law." Sin, then, is transgression. But we have the phrase, "transgression and disobedience." These are not necessarily the same. The Jew who commits a sin of ignorance is a transgressor in the first sense of the word, but he is not therefore guilty of an act of disobedience. But if, when such transgression comes to his knowledge, he refuses to offer the appointed sacrifice, he is then guilty of a sin of disobedience.

There is no law in the Word of God to punish with death for a sin of ignorance; such law could only come against the ignorant sinner because he refused to recognise such sin, when it became known to him, in the appointed way. Though seemingly very simple, this is really a matter of great importance to the Christian. Rightly understood, it shews him plainly that he can keep God's commandments, and that he need not feel condemned for what he does amiss in the integrity of his heart.

Adam's sin, in relation to all posterity, may be considered a sin of ignorance; but that sin having been brought to our knowledge, if we refuse to avail ourselves of the only means of atonement, we are guilty of disobedience. As a further confirmation of this view, we may observe that an untrue statement is not inevitably a lie. A lie is an assertion known to the speaker to be false. Ananias told a lie, because he knew that he had sold his land for more than he paid into the common fund. A calm reflection on this subject would be of great service curbing the tongue, and avoiding the improper application of terms indicative of the gravest sins.

Examples of disobedience are given for our warning. The characters who, in Old and New Testament history, have walked righteously before God, who have not wilfully and deliberately transgressed His laws, will no doubt share with the brilliancy of planetary stars in the galaxy of the kingdom of the heavens.

It is not possible to lie, steal, commit adultery, fornication, and murder in ignorance, because these things mean the saying of what we know to be untrue; the doing of what we know to be sinful. With the exception of murder, which appears to be an unpardonable crime, it is not for us to describe the precise limits of the mercy of God. Christ's advice to Peter, His treatment of him after Peter denied Him three times over, and the general examples we have of the long-suffering of the Almighty, leave considerable latitude to hope for the salvation of truly penitent and reformed offenders. But we shall do well to call to remembrance those words of Paul, "What, shall we sin then that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?"

Among all the stars the Star of Bethlehem shines the brightest. Jesus rises highest in the scale of Divine law. His obedience was perfect. Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Job, Daniel, and John make up a set of jewels of rich lustre; but they all pale before The Mountain of Light, the Grand Kohinoor of the Almighty's signet. The Divine cutting and polishing of this Gem added flash after flash; and we wait the day when the Foundation Stone of the Fullness of Light shall be set in Zion, the admiration and glory of heaven and earth.

The obedience of Adam was an image of the obedience of Jesus; his physical constitution was identical; his innocence foreshadowed the spotlessness of his great Anti-type; his fatherhood to the human family resembled the new creation out of "the second man," who is now immortal; his act sealed for ever the lot of all his children, in which there is a parallel in regard to the children of Christ; for being in Christ all will be made alive again, for weal or woe, life or death perpetual is the only alternative of this indissoluble bond.

But where shall we find any likeness between these two Sons of God after the transgression of the first? The fruit once tasted, Adam ceases to be an image of Jesus. We look in vain to find one single ray beaming from his face upon the lowly birth-place of God's only begotten Son. He stands awhile in Eden, then cast out, a dark figure clothed with shame, the fit image of the world's toil and grief. The forgiveness of his crime and the hiding of his shame could not restore his original brightness; he had for ever lost his first estate. Had he remained innocent and free, the path of duty would have led him up to a higher heaven, a state from which there is no fall. He would have become con-substantial with the Tree of Life.

### **LOVE AND DEATH.**

We tremble before the Almighty's wrath; but it is always pleasing to discover, and to dwell upon, the justice and mercy of His ways. Under the present heading we wish to consider the wisdom and beauty of God's plan in bringing the salvation of our race out of the disobedience of Adam.

Adam was the author of death, but "love is stronger than death." The Almighty so loved the creature of His hand that he would not permit death to devour him from the face of the earth. The creature richly deserved this fate, but God does not delight even in the death of a sinner, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Human eyes can see no other means of saving mankind besides those devised and employed by the Almighty; but the thought of giving such a Son as Jesus to be cruelly slain for the benefit of the rebellious does not lie within the compass of words to fully and worthily express. The anguish and pity both of the Father and the Son belong rather to the language of sighs and tears than to written words.

Unless we suppose the Almighty and Jesus to be devoid of feeling, we may faintly picture the effect of this tragedy of love by calling to mind the near ties that bind us to our own offspring, and them to us. The echoes of the groans and sobs, of the last words of prayer reverberate from Gethsemane, through all the chaos and din of war, and stir the heart-strings of many a hopeful soul in this far off time.

The Gospel of John is pre-eminently the Gospel of Love. The same is true also of his Epistles; the word abounds everywhere. The grand theme is the Love of God to man through Christ, and the proof of it lies in the unspeakable gift.

It is enlightening and consoling to dwell upon this gift. It implies that Jesus was God's peculiar possession; that He held Him in His own right; that there was no just claim whatever upon Him. Here is seen an all-important difference between Jesus and Adam after his sin, and, by consequence, all his children. When Adam had sinned he was the servant of sin. In the exact language of Scripture, he was sin's bond slave; he was sin's flesh. This legal bondage of his own contracting made his children captives of sin like himself. It was an immense and awful sale. Henceforth all were "sold under sin;" all rights, honours, titles, and estate were forfeited; the world's master and heir of life now sunk into the disgrace, poverty, and chains of death. Such, by one simple act, became the legally altered condition of the first man.

Unless this act be clearly understood in its consequence to all mankind, it is to no purpose that we discourse upon the love of God in Christ. No ransom can be appreciated by a captive ignorant and careless of his condition. But where the Scriptures are believed and revered, it is an easy and delightful task to define the way of life.

The utter helplessness of man provoked the deep wisdom and love of God, more particularly we may suppose in regard to the children of Adam. Of these Paul says, they were made "subject to vanity, not willingly," "death reigned" over them though they "had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression."

All the attributes of God are in perfect harmony with each other. There is no unrighteousness in Him; and His righteousness may be understood by man, for the Apostle saith, it hath been declared; and to

declare a matter is to make it plain. "But now the righteousness of God is manifested without the law, being witnessed by the law and the prophets. Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, His righteousness, that He might be just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Our business is to shew to our fellows, not only the justification provided by God in Jesus, but to demonstrate the justice of it too. It is too general a custom to leave questions of religion un-sifted; to resort to the easy method of referring them to the mercy of God. But faith is very defective which lacks a strong sense of the justice of Jehovah's ways. It is a clear knowledge of right which confers a feeling of security. To say we rest our faith on Christ without a good understanding of the redemption in Christ, is not much more satisfactory, in a spiritual sense, than the belief that the earth rests on the back of a tortoise without enquiring what the tortoise rests on, is satisfactory in a physical sense.

"All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." This is true in two ways. First, all sinned in Adam. Paul says, "In whom (that is, Adam) all sinned." All have sinned by their own voluntary act. The first sin caused all mankind to "come short of the glory of God," that is, they fail to reach it. To this terrible rule there is no exception, "in Adam all die." It is not difficult to conceive some individual of this condemned race living according to all the known requirements of God, and it seems sad indeed that such an one should be cut off, as according to this conception he would be, solely for the offence of another; for a fault which we may assume he would not have committed.

But this difficulty is met by "the redemption in Christ Jesus." As a matter of fact, not of supposition, we see that first of all death reigned supreme. Against this there is no appeal. What can be more evident than that no act of righteousness can subvert this universal decree? The good behaviour of a prisoner cannot commute the just sentence passed upon him. It may appear a great pity that so well behaved a person should be shut up in a cell, and sovereign mercy may grant a reprieve, but unless the good conduct subsequent to imprisonment were previously made a condition of shortening the term of punishment, such a measure would contravene justice. We cannot regard the Judge of all the earth in this light. He sees the end from the beginning, and therefore commits no mistake. Let us now place the proposed Deliverer in the position contemplated; let Him be, for the moment, one of the "all who sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Now make Him the grand exception to the rule; make him obedient in all things; is there no difficulty in unerring justice freeing him from the sentence? Is there no flaw in permitting him thus to effect his own escape? If we answer "No," then it is clear that the law said to bring death on all, was not fixed and universal. But that there is no disputing; the law is couched in language which no honest reader can doubt; it admits of no exception whatsoever; therefore it would not be possible in justice to permit one born a sinner to be his own deliverer.

To spare the Almighty from all liability to the imputation of partiality and injustice in the matter, we have only to look at what He has done. He has devised and carried out a plan which furnishes most absolute proof of His righteousness, as well as of His mercy in the work. His mercy shines all the brighter because we see it in the clear light of justice. It is not the kind of mercy which human judges sometimes err in, under the impression, good enough in itself, that it is better to err, if at all, on the side of mercy. No: the Almighty is most merciful, but He does not err therein.

To be "just and the justifier" God sent forth His OWN SON, and commanded Him to give "His life a ransom for all." No other man could do this because his life was lost in the first transgression, to say nothing of his own voluntary sins. But we may be asked to prove that the life of God's Son was free from this claim. The same fact which proves that Adam was free from death at first, proves that Jesus was free also. Adam was God's own child. While he remained obedient he was free from sin, therefore free from death. When he disobeyed he became the child of sin, and ceased to be the child of God.

This changed condition is forcibly set forth in the language of the apostle, "Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." "For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness." "But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life." The words of the apostle John agree with those of Paul, and place the subject in a very clear light. "But as many as received Him, to them He gave power (or the right, or privilege) to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name." The language of the epistle is also very pointed, "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God."

"Beloved, now are we the sons of God."

Whose sons were these before they became the sons of God? The apostle replies, they were the sons of sin. This sonship to sin began in Eden; and purchase began there also. God purchased Adam, or bought him back from sin at the price of blood. The transaction was figurative of the purchase to be effected by the great and precious price, even the life-blood of the Son of God. The freedom of Adam from sin began with his birth, and remained while his obedience lasted. All this time he was “the figure of Him who was to come.”

But Adam was not then a perfect image of all the conditions under which his great antitype was to become the Son of God; still his estate served sufficiently well for a strong type of his successor. The difference was this: Adam was made son of God from the ground; Jesus was the begotten Son by Holy Spirit from a daughter of Adam. This difference brings us to speak of the reason of the origin of Jesus, previously alluded to.

It is important to the correct comprehension of the grand scheme of “redemption in Christ Jesus” to apprehend this point without confusion. It has been said that the salvation of man required the Saviour to appear in the nature that transgressed. This is perfectly true: but it does not fully state the necessity of the case. Suppose the Saviour had been formed, as Adam was, from the dust of the ground, the same human, perishable constitution, He would then have been a partaker of the nature that sinned; but though a partaker, or though of the identical nature, He would have had no relation to the race. He would have been a person of precisely the same physical constitution, but the first member of another and entirely distinct family. This is very plainly seen by supposing the first and the second Adam to be made, each from the dust, on the same day. They would be both alike, but without any tie of relationship to each other,

In that case there would have been no bond of brotherhood, no sympathy, no power of deliverance. This is why the Redeemer must take on Him, not only the same nature, but be also a blood relation to him who transgressed. This He became by the mother’s side. One of the family of man must be the Redeemer of man. A member of another family or of another nature had no proper connection, and therefore could render no service. The great problem for solution was, How could there be produced a branch of the same family, flesh of its flesh and bone of its bone, and yet be able to give his life a ransom?

Profoundest problem! Most glorious solution!

Shall we seek for help from a sinner? Shall we place the Deliverer in the death-stricken position of all his brethren? Shall we allow Him to “learn obedience by the things that He suffered,” and then mock Him with the bars of death? May all be spared this awful reflection on the justice of Almighty God.

Most glorious solution! God Himself takes up the case; becomes the Father of another Adam, but related to the first by ties of blood. Hence we behold at once the family relationship and the original innocence. If this man can sustain purity of character throughout, then give His life as the price of the lost treasure, the plan of salvation from death is clearly shewn. All depends upon this. His Father has started Him just where He started the “first man;” will He overcome, or will He fail? Thanks be to God, and thanks be to Jesus also, He hath overcome, “He hath prevailed.” Never was death so mingled with love and pity, with joy and sorrow, as the death of Jesus. “God loved us while we were yet sinners,” “Christ died for the ungodly,” “The Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God,” the blood of the “undefiled, and separate from sinners,” became the price of ransom, the fountain to wash and cleanse from sin and all uncleanness. With Paul we may say, “We always triumph in Christ,” and that “nothing shall be able to separate us from the love of God,” “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor? Or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things: to Whom be glory for ever. Amen.”

### **THE HEIR OF ALL THINGS.**

The doctrine of Divine heirship is a feature in the plan of redemption which well deserves our careful consideration. Paul teaches that in this respect Jesus was superior to the angels. “For unto which of the angels said He at any time, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee? And again, I will be to Him a Father, and He shall be to Me a Son? And again, when He bringeth the first begotten into the world, He saith, And let all the angels of God worship Him.” The pre-eminence of Jesus from His birth is, by this testimony, placed beyond all doubt. Paul previously stated that Jesus was “made so much better than the angels, as He hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.” This “more excellent name” signified that He was to be the Saviour of the world; it signified that the bearer of it was destined to save the world of mankind from death, which implies that without Him men would in time all perish under the law of sin.

By the Father's side Jesus is heir to the world. He hath given all things into His hand; the uttermost parts of the earth are his. His human relationship to the house of David gives Him a special right and title to the kingdom of Israel. Inheritance was not reckoned among the Jews by the female line. Joseph was of the house of David; and though not the actual father of Jesus, the adopted son born in marriage is heir to the estate of his ancestors.

Jesus was not like Moses, a servant in the house or kingdom; He was a Son over His own house. Adam was at the first in a similar position. He was God's son; heir to eternal life and the inheritance of the world. All his descendants were put out of the heirship with him by his fault. His children occupy the degraded position of the children of a nobleman who by treason has lost his estate. Though the heir pursue the most reputable course of conduct, nothing can make reparation, nothing he can do can put the estate in his possession. We have many instances of this in history. The loss of Eden and the introduction of death is a parallel case. And the lot of the descendants of Adam had been hard indeed without the rich provision in Christ. He forms the bright side to the dark cloud. But if we suppose Him to have been in the same condition as they, then the cloud is all dark, not one ray illumines the sad future; the woe is rather augmented by the introduction of a figure so pure and worthy, yet so helpless. And if we imagine the Almighty to be moved to pity at the sight, to restore this son to the lost estate, we establish an error in Divine justice; in a word, we make the Deity partial, and a breaker of His own laws.

These facts and considerations make it imperative that the Heir to the world, the Heir to the throne of Israel, and the Saviour of men, should be a free born Son; and we cannot conceive any other way by which this could be than by God becoming His Father through the medium of a woman of the fallen family. No man could have discovered this. It was unsearchable; the unsearchable mystery; the hidden wisdom in which Paul rejoices that he had so great a knowledge.

The manner in which Jesus spoke of Himself and His authority while on earth is yet another argument in favour of what appears to be a necessity, viz., that He must be like Adam, free born. He held Himself higher than the Mosaic law. As they passed through the cornfields on the Sabbath day, and plucked the ears of corn, the Pharisees complained. The act of plucking corn was not unlawful for a Jew but they alleged it to be a breach of the Sabbath law. Then Jesus spake and said, "The Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath day." If this had only reference to the future sabbath of His reign on earth, and not to His superiority to the Jewish laws, there would have been no force whatever in the saying; but if the allusion made was to the Mosaic Sabbath, then it gives us a very exalted idea of Jesus. The meaning appears to be this - I am now Lord of all; though I do not exercise such authority, I am superior to your law. I am above all things. Could any son of Adam talk after this manner? By no means; that was only proper to the Son of God, "the second Adam; the beginning of the new creation."

The Jews did not understand this. They looked upon Jesus as they looked upon all other men. To them He was Joseph's son; a carpenter, an inhabitant of Nazareth, from whence no good had ever emanated, and, in their opinion, never would. They did not recognise his higher rights and privileges; in short, in their eyes Jesus was far inferior to the members of their Sanhedrim. But if we discern these two things, the proper relationship of Jesus to God, to the Adamic family, and the conception the Jews formed of Him, their hostility on the one hand and His exalted carriage on the other will be more justly understood. In Peter's address on healing the cripple, he said to the Jews, "But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; and killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses." This informs us that Jesus was, in the days of His flesh, just as much the Prince or Author of Life as He was the Holy One and the Just. It should be plain to everyone that no person already under sentence of death could be correctly styled the Prince of Life. And when we come to dwell upon the other two titles, "the Holy One and the Just," that is to say, such by pre-eminence for in all things Jesus had the pre-eminence, it would seem equally unreasonable to apply such titles to one who was constituted a sinner by his birth.

That passage of Isaiah, in chapter ix. 6, has something in it which seems strongly to corroborate the foregoing remarks: "Unto us a child is born; unto us a son is given." Not merely that a child has been born in Israel of kingly race, but that the child born is, in a peculiar manner, "a son given" of God; in other words, the child shall be God's own Son.

The virginity of the mother of Jesus is a matter of great moment. Had the Almighty's Son been the child of a married wife, as it would appear He might have been, without any just prejudice, an objection might, and probably would, have been raised on all hands. But the well-known respectability and virtue of both Mary and her future husband, Joseph, is quite sufficient guarantee for the miraculousness of the conception.

Jesus was quite as much entitled to those high marks of distinction in the flesh as in the Spirit. Though not in the actual or full exercise of the prerogatives enumerated by the prophet - Wonderful,

Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of the age to come, Prince of peace - He was certainly the elect of them all. And in view of these honours, nay, this equality with God, how can it be imagined that He came into the world a constitutional sinner, "by nature a child of wrath, even as others."

[To be continued.]

-----

## THE FIRST AND SECOND ADAMS.

BY BRO. JOHN BUTLER, OF BIRMINGHAM.

Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, while on earth, taught the importance of the subject I am, in this paper, about to discuss. "This," He said, "is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. This declaration is our warrant for continually inquiring and testing the foundations of our faith and if we at any time find there is a further advance to be made beyond the stand point we have already attained, our duty is clear. We must allow no private or personal considerations to deter us from making the necessary advance. We must march under the banner of the truth and the truth alone, and follow whithersoever that banner leads. We must not delude ourselves with the idea that the bones of the truth have, in these days, by any man or any number of men, been picked perfectly clean, and settle down, in consequence, into that attitude of anti-investigation which is the characteristic of the denominations around us. The mottoes of the Christadelphians have hitherto been the scripture ones, "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good" "To the law and the testimony," and shame and confusion of face be to them now who, because a new light which has been thrown upon an important question has not fallen from a certain quarter, refuse to have their eyes opened to it or by it, and sit and wrap themselves in the very mantle of contentment with present knowledge, which it has been our great endeavour to pull from others. As Dr. Thomas, in his "Elpis Israel," says, the maxim, "Disturb not that which is quiet," is a capital maxim for a rotten cause. "Sinners," he further says, "however pious they may be reputed to be, are invariably cowards; they are ashamed of a bold stand for their profession, and afraid of an independent and impartial examination of the law and testimony of God." And shall these words apply with equal truth to the true brethren of Christ Jesus? Depend upon it they never can. The "Don't disturb" policy will never be upheld by them.

To begin at the beginning of our subject involves a glance backward to the beginning of our race. We find there that Adam and Eve, our first parents, were placed in the garden of Eden on probation, but before considering the nature and conditions of that probation, let us regard the nature with which Adam, at his creation, was endowed; because it is held by some that he was, before the fall, an immortal, immaculate being, and that by his disobedience he was changed from that condition into a corruptible, mortal, vitiated being, both morally and physically. The record of his creation says, "The Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," or being, or animal. Paul, referring to this fact observes, that "he was of the earth earthy," and he contrasts him with the then inherently immortal, the Lord from Heaven. This conclusively shows that Adam, when he was created, was merely a flesh and blood being like any one of us, and therefore a corruptible body, for flesh and blood, says Paul, cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, nor corruption inherit incorruption. Adam, therefore like his descendants, simply dwelt in a house of clay, and, consequently, apart from God's interposition, he was exposed to all those surrounding influences which could bring upon him weariness, decay, and ultimately death. God, in fact, had merely to withdraw His favour and with it His sustaining influence, however imparted, and Adam in simple obedience to the flesh and blood organization he possessed, would hasten to decay and death. But though thus inherently corruptible and possessing a tendency to mortality or deathfulness, corruption was not allowed to operate so long as the probation upon which Adam entered after creation was satisfactorily borne. By what means God afforded that sustaining influence which kept inoperative those seeds of decay within him by the very nature of his constitution, we cannot positively affirm. I am of opinion that He afforded it through the instrumentality of the Tree of Life, which was not a forbidden tree, you will recollect, and from which he was driven after his fall, lest he should then continue to partake of it; but the question, though an interesting one, is not a very important one, and does not materially affect the subject under discussion. Sufficient that Adam was sustained to the end of his probationary career. With the nature of the probation we are all familiar. Adam was forbidden to eat of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, but, induced by the subtle

representation of the serpent, Eve first and then Adam did partake of it, and, as a consequence, they came under the curse pronounced the curse of death.

Now, before referring to the mode whereby the Deity carried out this curse, let us for a moment turn to the cause of the transgression. So-called orthodoxy places the discredit of the fall entirely, or almost entirely, to the serpent, which it considers the immortal devil of popular belief. We, as Christadelphians, having become more acquainted with scriptural truth, have very naturally discarded this old heathenish belief; but whilst doing so have we allowed due weight to the real reason of the fall? Have we, too, not placed too much of the credit or discredit upon the serpent, though not regarding that serpent in the orthodox light. Dr. Thomas, in "Elpis Israel," page 77, declares that sin or the transgression of God's law, is the morbid principle of an evil conscience; and further on (page 113) he says - "The word sin is used in two principal acceptations in the Scriptures. It signifies, in the first place the transgression of the law, and in the next it represents that physical principle of the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases, death, and resolution into dust. It is that in the flesh which has the power of death, and it is called sin, because the development or fixation of this evil in the flesh was the result of transgression. In as much as this evil principle pervades every part of the flesh, the animal nature is styled sinful flesh, that is, flesh full of sin, so that sin in the sacred style came to stand for the substance called man. In human flesh dwells no good thing, and all the evil a man does is the result of this principle dwelling in him. Operating upon the brain, it excites the propensities, and these set the 'intellect' and 'sentiments' to work. The propensities are blind, and so are the intellect and sentiments in a purely natural state. When, therefore, the latter operate under the sole influence of the propensities, 'the understanding is darkened through ignorance because of the blindness of the heart.' The nature of the lower animals is as full of this physical evil principle as the nature of man, though it cannot be styled sin with the same expressiveness, because it is not in them as the result of their own transgression. The name, however, does not alter the nature of the thing."

Here you will perceive the Doctor alleges that there are two kinds of sin - transgression and that fixed principle in the animal nature which is the cause of all its diseases and death. It is very important to inquire how far the Doctor is correct in this declaration, for in warfare it is great assistance to a man to know who or what he has to contend with. The idea that there is a supernatural being within us, urging us on to the commission of sin is very apt to paralyse our efforts in resisting temptation, and is not the same equally true if we labour under the impression that there is an evil principle pervading every part of our flesh - that our flesh is full of sin. Apart from the fact that Scripture speaks, so far as I know, of only one kind of sin - the transgression of the law - it cannot, I think, be conclusively proved that the serpent instilled any fixed principle of any kind into our first parents. There was nothing required in the fall of Adam but the uncontrolled operation of desires or propensities with which he was already endowed. As a flesh and blood organisation Adam must have possessed certain desires in harmony with that nature; he must have derived or sought enjoyment through the operation of his senses. He would possess an ardent desire for knowledge, an appetite for food. These were necessarily the endowments with which he was gifted at his creation, and when God pronounced him, with everything else that He had made, very good. It was not wrong to desire knowledge, it was not wrong to desire food; nay, they were not only not wrong, they were in themselves good things, and intended to minister to the enjoyment of Adam. The wrong consisted in simply carrying that which was legitimate to an illegitimate extent. He must not appease his desire for food on ground forbidden. This he did, and thereby the law of Eden became violated. The serpent, who we are told was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord had made, took advantage of that which in itself was good to work man's ruin. He drew attention to the beauty of the fruit forbidden, and misrepresenting the results of partaking of it; Eve, forgetful of what she ought ever to have been mindful, namely, God's prohibition, or else ignorant through ignorance of the faithfulness of the Deity to His promise, fell into the snare, and involved her husband also from the same cause.

Now, two things are evident from the consideration of these facts, viz., that the serpent instilled nothing in the nature of a principle into the mind of Adam, either fixed or loose, which was not there before, and that it is incorrect to speak of sin as a fixed principle at all. I admit that corruptible flesh is necessarily weak, and that the desires natural to it, unchecked, tend to sin, and this, I imagine, is what the Doctor really meant; but on that account to call flesh necessarily full of sin would be to stigmatise Adam as a sinner before he sinned, and Jesus a sinner though He never sinned; for Adam and Eve desired to eat of the forbidden fruit before they actually did eat, and Jesus wished the cup to pass from Him which He knew the Father required Him to drink. But neither in the one case nor the other was the desire sin. All the desires of our nature are good in themselves, and only become sin, and therefore obnoxious to God, when they are exercised in opposition to law. Do I eat or do I drink moderately, I simply obey the law of my being, but when I eat or drink to excess I violate the law of my being, I violate God's declared law

against drunkenness and gluttony and that is sin, and if that is sin in the end which was right and proper at the beginning, how can we say that sin is a fixed principle within us. It is true that there is a constant tendency in the flesh to exceed the bounds of moderation, and therefore a constant tendency to sin but let us not forget the tendency itself is not sin. "Every man is tempted," says James, "when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." So even lust, which is generally regarded as sin, properly defined, only means desire, and is not sin till it has conceived or been carried into action beyond law. Let the flesh with all its desires be kept under proper control, and as in the beginning it is still good, but it is good only as a servant. Like fire and water, it is a bad master but a good servant. Like them it has an inherent tendency to dominate, but who would think of condemning fire or water because if it is not kept under it will work mischief. Man has sometimes been compared to a Republic, and there is great truth and force in the analogy. He is a combination of the animal, the intellectual, and the moral. This combination was a creation of God. The Deity intended on the animal basis to build an intellectual and moral superstructure. He therefore placed the animal he had made with his sensations and propensities under control, well aware that there could be no development of the higher faculties without control. Placed in a position as Adam was after his expulsion, and as we are to a greater extent than he, in which our very existence depends upon the exercise of our mere animal faculties, there is everything to quicken those selfish instincts; and it is self-evident that without some law whereby we might be able to limit our natural propensities and keep them within bounds, the higher faculties of our nature could have no scope for exercise. Without law, which calls our attention from ourselves and our own fleshly requirements to the well-being of our fellow creatures and the purpose God has put us in relation to, we should waste our time entirely upon the flesh, and might just as well have been created without speech or reason.

The animal is very good, but it is only good in its place, and when carrying out the Creator's intention. The moral and intellectual must have scope upon its basis. The three faculties, the animal, the moral, and the intellectual, must be duly balanced; they must each take their proper place, and perform their proper functions in the human economy. They, as it were, constitute a Parliament, their constituencies being the various organs of the brain. The animal member may represent the Chancellor of the Exchequer; it has to look after the maintenance or sustenance of the general fabric - it has the management of the finances. The department of the intellectual representative is to be devoted to the acquirement of knowledge, whilst the moral must see to the right application both of finances and the knowledge acquired. It must, in fact, before the whole economy works in harmony with its high destiny, occupy the chair. But on the opening of Parliament the animal is in the chair, and it is exceedingly difficult to persuade him to vacate it. In most cases, indeed, he never will vacate it, and in every case he is ready to seize every opportunity to regain possession of it; and when in possession, the truth of Paul's words is demonstrated, that in the flesh - that is, in the uncontrolled dominancy of the flesh - dwelleth no good thing. Uncontrolled, the desires lead to all unrighteousness - fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness, envy, murder, deceit, malignity. But controlled, that is, with morality in the chair and intellect at his right hand, the law of God in his right hand, man becomes clothed and in his right mind. He walks in harmony with the Creator's intentions. But the light of God's will must shine into the Parliament house, for without it the arms of both morality and intellect are paralyzed. The animal resumes power, and man walks without God and without hope in the world.

(To be continued.)

---

## THE BREAKING OF BREAD.

The charge, which Pliny the younger, in his letter to Trajan, six years after the death of "the beloved apostle," preferred against the disciples of Jesus, would have had little or no force against those who have left off eating the Lord's supper every first day of the week, and who eat only once a year. It was alleged that these simple people obstinately assembled on the first day before sunrise to eat together and to bind themselves to do no harm.

If they had "neglected the assembling of themselves together as the manner of some is," they might have been tempted to wander, under the pressure of persecution, into some of the Pagan temples, and to eat of the things offered to idols. Their weekly gathering kept the great sacrifice for the sins of the whole

world fresh in their memories, and kindled anew the love of God shed abroad in their hearts through Christ.

The observance of the ordinance before sunrise might be on account; of the duties many of those disciples had to perform on that day. Some were slaves to Romans, who regarded their worship as an abominable superstition; others were servants to Jews, whose day of worship being Saturday, had no respect for the first day of the week, and worse than none for a religious service on account of one whom they looked upon as a great political disturber and an impostor.

Justin Martyr, who wrote about forty years after the death of John, informs us that the Christians - the name was new then - met together on Sunday, being the day of their Lord's resurrection, to read publicly the writings of the apostles and prophets; that after this the president made an oration to them, exhorting them to imitate and practise the things which they had heard, and that after joining in prayer they used to celebrate the sacrament and give alms.

The custom of the first disciples brings us, according to these historical notices, down about 120 years after the death of Christ, or to A.D. 153, shewing that the same practice first observed by the Jewish Christians was also followed by the Gentile. The scripturalness of the ordinance thus celebrated is confirmed and sealed by the hand of inspired men. When Paul called at Troas there were with him several Gentile converts; Sopater, of Berea, Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, besides those others living at Troas who came with the disciples on the first day of the week to break bread.

"Concerning the collection for the saints," for the distribution of alms to the poor, as mentioned by Justin, Paul gave the same direction to the believers at Corinth as he had given to the church at Galatia. The "liberality" was to be offered "upon the first day of the week," when they came together for the breaking of bread. By the general consent of Christians the first day of the week came to be called "the Lord's day," and it is thought by some that the mention of "the Lord's day," in Rev. i. 10, refers to the first day of the week, notwithstanding that the things seen by John were, in some measure, to be fulfilled in the day of the Lord's reign on earth.

Paul speaks of the breaking of bread as the Christian Passover, and exhorts the brethren everywhere, but at Corinth in particular, to "keep the feast - or holy-day - not with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." This is to be done for the reason that "Christ our Passover is slain for us." In this counsel the Apostle makes a beautiful use and interpretation of the Jewish Passover and feast of unleavened bread, which lasted seven days, probably in sign of the perfect continuance in well doing, and that unspottedness from the world which Christ requires of all who profess to be His disciples.

It is a duty incumbent on all who understand and believe the gospel to persuade others to embrace it, but it would appear almost a greater duty to assemble themselves regularly to break bread, and, by earnest and thoughtful exhortation "to provoke one another to love and to good works." In the face of apostolic usage and the subsequent punctuality of their survivors, we are quite unable to perceive on what scripture grounds the ordinance can be neglected by those who profess to walk in the footsteps of the Apostles and their approved associates.

The Jewish Passover fell on the first day of the first month of the sacred year, or the seventh month of the civil year, called Abib or Nisan. The first month of the sacred year was the one whose full moon followed next after the vernal equinox, and therefore sometimes answered to March and sometimes to April, and sometimes to parts of both. The paschal lamb was slain on the fourteenth day of the month, at even, and every morsel was either eaten that night or consumed with fire. On the sixteenth, the first-fruits of the barley harvest were presented, and the twenty-first was the end of the Passover and of the days of unleavened bread. In the vicinity of Jericho barley was ripe; wheat partly in ear; the fig trees were in blossom; and the winter figs still lingering on the tree.

What was this feast but a shadow of better things to come? Those who break bread once a year in conformity to the Jewish Passover, do neither the one thing nor the other according to the Scriptures. To eat a loaf of bread and to drink of a cup of wine is not to keep the original Passover, and to do this once in the year is a practical subversion of apostolic precept and example, which require the ordinance to be celebrated every week.

EDITOR

## REMARKS ON BRO. W. H. HACKING'S LETTER

"Grossly deceived" by the Christadelphian, and pleased with the Lamp, the Editor of the Marturion offers us his apology for certain animadversions in recent issues of his periodical. "We accept what he says in good faith, and will only observe that it is often dangerous to be in a hurry. Complaints of being "deceived," and of "misrepresentation," keep dropping in from America and Australia, along with "thanks" and "pleasure" for the "enlightenment" received from the Christadelphian Lamp. With all sincere seekers after truth we have great sympathy, inasmuch as truth is our only object, and that for its own sake. For the rest, we shall endeavour to "take things as they come," "for better or for worse."

Bro. Hacking writes: "I find that on many points . . . we perfectly agree with you." This is well, provided that on said points we also are perfectly correct; if not, it is hoped that time and the efforts of the better informed will make us so.

"All the types teach that the flesh of Jesus was pure and spotless, as well as His character; He was holy, harmless, undented, both mentally and physically." That is, we understand, there was no such thing as "sin in the blood," nor any evil chargeable against his conduct.

But that sinful flesh was a myth created by Dr. Thomas and R. Roberts is more than questionable. It would be easy enough to shew that this "myth" - for with Bro. Hacking we think it is not a reality - was fashionable, so to speak, in the schools of theology a thousand years ago. But if the worthy Doctor had created it, he had certainly no assistance in that work from the gentleman next mentioned, who seems to have created nothing except a great disturbance, and much ill-feeling among those to whom he ought to have set a better example. His hindrance in the way of creating or forming any new idea was completely effected by his adoption of "the whole truth as brought to light by Dr. Thomas," and the consequent exclusion of any fresh thought. This, had the Doctor lived five or ten years longer, retaining that vigorous thinking power for which he was so remarkable, this, we say, would have placed him in a position of great singularity. It is more than probable he would have objected to the intellectual vacuum, especially as it would have been imposed upon him by one so much his inferior in most things which contribute to make a solid and fertile mind.

Again. "We hold and teach," writes Bro. Hacking, "that Adam sold himself and all in him, or all his posterity, to sin, and in this way condemnation to death fell upon all men." To this we agree. But when it is added that Jesus was "one of the race," or, as just before stated, of "the posterity" of Adam, then we are bound to refuse acquiescence. None are of Adam's posterity but those who were begotten by a male of his descent. Jesus was the begotten Son of God, and therefore not Adam's posterity. Jesus appeared in Adam's nature, but He was not Adam's begotten son; He can only be called son of Adam in a wide sense, somewhat similar to the sense in which He is called "son of Joseph," that is to say, son by adoption. The oft reiteration that Jesus is God's only begotten Son renders it superfluous to insist that he was not Adam's son; and not being Adam's son, he was not liable for Adam's sin.

As to heirship, that He derived from heaven, and was consequently not "liable for all debts and encumbrances" incurred by a man who was not his father. In a word, Jesus was not a son of Adam, but a second Adam made in the nature of the first, and son of God.

It was a necessity that the Redeemer should appear in the same nature that had sinned at the first. Papists tell us that Adam was immortal before he sinned, and that the fall was from immortality to mortality. We do not believe this; for Christ declares that they who are immortal cannot die any more. Jesus was not obliged to die because he appeared in Adam's nature, or else Adam would have been obliged to die even if he had not sinned. If being clothed with human nature make it obligatory to die, what is to be said of Enoch, of Elijah, and of those who shall "not all sleep?" Jesus, though not compelled to die because he was human, was made human in order that he might die for the sins of the world. In the language of scripture, "He was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death."

"Now, Bro. Turney, you need not try to get over this," that Jesus needed redemption or deliverance from the corruptible or mortal constitution. We humbly assure our worthy co-labourer that we have no super-abundant strength; and that it would be a serious exertion and misuse of the little at our command to be trying "to get over" obstacles which have no existence in the course we are endeavouring to run. There are obstacles enough to exercise our limited powers, without erecting castles in the air."

Jesus undoubtedly needed to be redeemed or delivered from death. A dead man has no physical power to raise himself up. This, together with what may be found in "The Sacrifice of Christ" and elsewhere, will perhaps be sufficient, and spare us the supposed necessity of a conflict with a Greek verb in "the reflective voice."

We are thankful to the Marturion for promising to “stand by” the Lamp “shoulder to shoulder,” and sincerely hope that their forces may never be found threatening to push one another out of the perpendicular.

EDITOR.

---

## CHARITY.

A knowledge and belief of the faith once for all delivered to the saints is essentially necessary if we would be approved of when we appear before the judgment seat of Christ, and a God-like walk and conversation is equally necessary. Peter tells us that we should add to our faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge, and to knowledge temperance, and to temperance patience, and to patience godliness, and to godliness brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness charity. For, he continues, if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. But he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins. One pre-eminent attribute of the Deity is love, for we read “God is love,” and we must be “followers of God as dear children” in this respect by walking in love, for those who love not are not of God. Though we have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, and though we have all faith so that we could remove mountains, and have not charity, we are nothing. And when we realize what our condition was, and what by divine favour and love it now is, but especially when we realize the glorious destiny to which we are called, and that for ever, we cannot fail being constrained to love God who hath so loved us. “If a man say I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar, for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?” It is quite a simple thing, and comes quite naturally even to the men of the world, to love those who love them, and to do good to those who have done the like to them, but this is no proof of our being animated with that love by which all Christ’s true brethren must be distinguished, for it shows itself in loving those who hate us, and in doing good to those who despitely use us; it shows itself in good deeds towards the unthankful and the evil. And ere we arrive at this perfection of love to God and love to man, we need not expect to be anywise benefitted by the truth, however correct our knowledge of it may be, and however contentious and zealously affected we may be for it, for ere we do so we are holding the truth in unrighteousness, and Paul assures us that upon all such the wrath of God shall descend.

We Christadelphians, everywhere, have need at all times to keep these truths in mind, but in an especial manner have we occasion in this present time of division and strife which is raging amongst us, to have such thoughts impressed on our minds, so that though we be reviled and persecuted, and have all manner of evil said against us falsely for Christ’s sake, we may not be tempted to render evil for evil, or railing for railing, but contrariwise blessing. Let us love our enemies, bless them that curse us, do good to them that hate us, and pray for them that despitely use us and persecute us. And, if we can, in reference to those who condemn and revile us, say with the Psalmist, “For it was not an enemy that reproached me, then I could have borne it, neither was it he that hated me that did magnify himself against me, then I would have hid myself from him. But it was thou, a man mine equal, my guide and mine acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company,” it makes it all the more saddening and hard to bear, but at the same time it should enable us all the more easily to comply with the injunctions contained in the above quotations.

Let us who, by the favour of God, have come to a true knowledge concerning His Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus the Christ, be in no wise afraid nor dismayed at the charges of inconsistency and insincerity which are heaped upon us, but hold on the even tenor of our way, still growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, appropriating the language of Paul to the saints at Philippi, “I count not myself to have apprehended, but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are “before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.” And to the end that we may gain this prize, let us ever keep in memory the writings of those holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, and discard the writings of fallible man, following in the steps of our Great Example, who suffered for us, who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth, who, when He was reviled, reviled not again, but committed his cause to Him who judgeth righteously. For we must now in a moral sense be like what He was while in the flesh, if we would have our vile bodies changed that they may be fashioned like unto His

glorious body, and thus become possessors of the glorious destiny which shall be bestowed on all the faithful, when He appears the second time without a sin-offering unto salvation. Brethren, let our united prayer to the God of patience and consolation be that the time may soon come when we shall be all of one mind and one judgment concerning the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, and whom to know is life eternal. At the same time I would be far from advocating a "peace at any price" policy, which is so popular amongst the names and denominations with which we are surrounded. No; we must, without fear or favour of man, declare the whole counsel of God as revealed in His word. We must earnestly contend for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, let whoever may be our opponents, but in doing so let us have compassion one of another; love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous. At all times and under all circumstances, let us be courteous.

Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it until he receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned; behold the judge standeth before the door. Be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer, and, above all things, having your love toward one another fervent, because love covers a multitude of sins.

G. L.

---

## **SUNDAY MORNING AT THE CHRISTADELPHIAN SYNAGOGUE, NOTTINGHAM - No. 1.**

**(From Shorthand Notes by Brother JOHN GLOVER.)**

DEAR BRETHREN AND SISTERS. - We have read this morning a portion of a very long and argumentative Epistle, written by the Apostle Paul and addressed to the saints in Rome. The Epistle contains very much of a doctrinal character and some things hard to be understood, but it also contains a great deal in the way of practical exhortation. And I am sure you will agree with me that it is very desirable, when we stand up to exhort one another, that our remarks should take a practical turn, and that we should not confine ourselves to matters of exposition.

In the 14th chapter of this epistle, which we have just been reading together, reference is made by the Apostle to differences which had arisen among the disciples of that ecclesia in Rome, and his object was to instruct the brethren as to the way in which they ought to conduct themselves with regard to the questions in dispute. You are doubtless aware that for some few years the Christian Churches were composed exclusively of believing Jews, and it was the introduction of the Gentile element which caused many differences to arise, which were previously unknown among them. The Jews, under the Mosaic order of things, had been accustomed to eat only certain kinds of meat, and to refuse others which were regarded as unclean by that law, while the Gentiles believed they might eat all things indifferently. The Jews again esteemed certain days to be holy, whereas the Gentiles looked upon all days as alike. In the first verse of this fourteenth chapter the Apostle speaks of certain as "weak in the faith," not weak in faith but weak in the faith, the weakness in question having no reference to any doubt existing in the minds of such as to the things constituting the one faith, but to abstinence from meats. Had it been otherwise the Apostle could not possibly have counselled the brethren to receive such weak ones among them. All were equally "in the faith," but some were denominated "strong," and others "weak," not in relation to the things concerning the Kingdom of God, which, says the Apostle, "is not meat and drink," but in reference to abstinence from meats and the observance of certain days. We perceive, then, that such weak brethren were to be received, and their infirmities borne by those who were strong, as the Apostle exhorts in the first verse of the fifteenth chapter. Receive them, says he, though not for the purpose of disputing with them about their peculiarities, but give them the right hand of fellowship, receive them among you as brethren in the Lord, meet with them at the Lord's table and despise them not, for God hath received them. Neither constitute yourselves their judges, for they stand or fall to their own Master, and God is able to make them stand. Thus tenderly and considerately were these weak brethren to be dealt with, but specially were the strong admonished not to put a stumbling block, or an occasion to fall in a brother's way, for while there was nothing that was unclean of itself, yet to him esteeming anything to be unclean, to him it was unclean. To induce a brother, therefore, to partake of anything which he felt in his

conscience was wrong, was to cause him to fall into sin, and even to incur the risk of destroying one for whom Christ died.

But the great question for us to consider in these days is the practical application of these exhortations to ourselves as individuals, and as a community of brethren holding the same faith, looking for the same blessed hope, and expecting the fulfilment of the same great and precious promises. We are not like the saints in Rome, a mixed community of Jews and Gentiles. We are not troubled by the coming in among us of disciples from among the Jews, who, from having been long disciplined in the peculiarities of the Mosaic code, retained all the prejudices of the Jew against the Gentile, whom they were accustomed to regard as dogs. Our case is far otherwise: we are all Gentiles, with scarcely an exception, though, having believed the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ, we have thereby become the spiritual seed of Abraham, and Jews in the higher or better sense.

The exhortations of the Apostle as to meats and days come home to us in this way. From time to time we are brought into contact with those who, being "weak in the faith," make it a matter of conscience to abstain from certain kinds of meat, swine's flesh, for instance, and how shall we deal with such? Precisely as the Apostle Paul counselled the Christians at Rome in his day. Receive them into fellowship, avoid any strife of words about their peculiarity, respect their conscientious scruples, pass no condemnation upon them, and, above all, be careful to do nothing to cause them to defile their conscience by partaking of that which they feel to be a sin, remembering the words of the Apostle that, "to him who esteemeth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean." To give a homely illustration of our meaning: Suppose we invited such an one to partake of our hospitality, should we not be walking uncharitably (or not according to love) if we placed the "unclean" article upon the table? Might not he, under such circumstances, be induced to partake, and thus be made to defile his conscience? Surely such a course would not be following "after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another." "All things indeed are pure, but it is evil for that man who eateth with offence. It is good neither to eat flesh, neither to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak." These admonitions are comprehensive and far reaching, and place before us a great principle of action by which we are to regulate our conduct in our intercourse one with another, not only in the matter of food and drink but as to our entire behaviour. Our example is either for good or for evil and not one of us can pass through life without more or less influencing our fellows. Our influence maybe small, but let us take care to exert it in the right direction. What would be our feelings did we know that our example had been the means of causing a brother to take the first false step in a downward course which ultimately led to his making shipwreck of the faith? Let us carefully avoid the very first approach to anything which our conscience tells us is wrong, and at once turn away from it. "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth." The kingdom of God, as preached by Jesus and His Apostles, understood and believed, will not lead a man to suppose that he can commend himself to the Almighty by abstinence from meats, which indeed are to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth (1 Tim. iv. 3), neither will it lead him to the practice of asceticism or austerity; these are not its fruits, but, on the contrary, the results which flow from a hearty belief of the things promised in the Gospel, are as enumerated by the Apostle, "righteousness and peace and joy in a Holy Spirit. For he that in these things serveth Christ is acceptable to God and approved of men."

Then again, with regard to the observance of days. There are those who needlessly offend their neighbours and prejudice their minds against the truth "by doing things on the first day of the week, for instance, which though not evil in themselves are so looked upon by many who consider that the Sunday should be observed somewhat in the same way as the Jews observed Saturday, which was their Sabbath. A Christian may lawfully do that on the first day of the week which he feels assured in his own conscience is harmless, yet if he thereby offends another or puts a stumbling block in his way, he should abstain on the principle laid down by the Apostle in this same epistle, that "every one is to please his neighbour for his good to edification, even as Christ pleased not Himself." He is to be our example in all things, for He has bought us with a price, and we are His servants or bond slaves and not our own, and whether we live or die we are His. While we are under no yoke of bondage in the matter, it is doubtless good to rest on the first day of the week, and to submit to the institutions of the powers that be, and under whom our lot is at present cast, so long as they do not conflict with the commands of God.

Thus I think you will perceive that, though these exhortations of the Apostle Paul were addressed so many centuries ago to believers whose circumstances were in several respects so different to our own, they are nevertheless applicable to ourselves, and that the principles on which they are based being unchangeable, are as binding upon us in the nineteenth century as they were on the saints in Rome in the first.

S. G. HAYES.

# **THE ANTI-TYPICAL ASPECTS OF THE LAW OF JEALOUSY, NUMBERS V., 11 TO END. BY JOHN CAMPBELL, OF NEW ZEALAND.**

This very singular law is a parable to illustrate things concerning Jesus the Christ. The Mosaic Law, as a whole, was a shadow of "heavenly things," - Heb. viii. 5, and represented pictorially the form of knowledge and of the truth. Rom. ii. 20. This law of jealousy, as a portion thereof, sets forth in a peculiar manner the great question that occupied the minds of the contemporaries of Jesus, while it opens up and gives prominence to the grand test of the fidelity of Jesus, assigning as it does motive and meaning to the arraignment of Jesus, to the incidents and events that surrounded His trial, and to the glorious issues evolved thereby. The interpretation here submitted lends a charm and beauty to the Mosaic Law, as it strikingly denotes the foreknowledge and wisdom of God to those who will receive it, and it elucidates the significance of the minutiae of its ceremonial observances for the manifestation of righteousness. The law of Jealousy, then, shadows forth the following particulars in relation to Him who is now the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth: -

1. The jealous husband is the law which had dominion over Jesus while He lived in His state of probation before God, perfecting holiness in His fear.

2. The suspected wife is Jesus the Christ, and God, who is the head of the Christ, 1 Cor. xi. 3, did thereby cause the fidelity of the wife to be officially tested.

3. The charge made by a husband is, under this law, that his nakedness has been discovered by the infidelity of his wife; and the charge made by the chief priests and rulers of the people as the administrators of the law against Jesus was that he perverted the nation, and they were filled with jealousy towards him. Luke xx. 19, 20.

4. Jealousy is the rage of a man, saith Solomon; and Jesus, because of this, was deprived of liberty and life. He was delivered up for envy, saith Matthew and Mark. xxvii. 18; xv. 10. Yet this word "envy" in the original is often and better translated "jealousy," and indeed this fiery emotion more exactly corresponds to the exhibition of their embittered feelings towards him than envy; it also supplies the link that binds and identifies the law of jealousy, and the wife obnoxious to its provisions, as Jesus.

5. The woman brought before the priest is Jesus brought before the Sanhedrim. Mark xiv. 53.

6. The nature of the offering, barley meal without oil, and frankincense, is found in the state of mind (see the agony in the garden) and in the prayer of Jesus in view of His becoming sin, or dying as a sinner or malefactor, in the sight of the people, for us. Luke xxii. 39-46; Mark xiv. 34-36.

7. The holy water (from the laver) is the Word of the Spirit, speaking by Caiaphas, who was a natural or carnal man. It shewed the word of prophecy "in an earthen vessel." He was not a man of faith, or it would be a vessel of silver and gold. John ii. 47 to 53 - xviii. 4. Numb. v. 17.

8. The dust of the Sanctuary added thereto is the vile abjects, the servants of the priesthood, who held Jesus, and mocked Him, and smote Him after the charges were concluded. Luke xxii. Isaiah 1. 6; lit. 14.

9. It was not possible that the cup should pass from the woman, or Jesus. Luke xxii. 42.

10. Verses 19 and 20 on the law of jealousy are but the preamble to verses 21 and 22, and find an explanation clear and painted in the solemn adjuration of the High Priest to Jesus. Matt. xxvi. 63. As the woman was there charged by the priest with an oath of cursing (which resolved into a blessing if innocent), so was Jesus called to answer upon oath, and the name of God invoked to heighten the grandeur of the trial, as to confirm by Divine interposition what they were not able to prove. Jesus consented to this appeal; indeed, he was not free to refuse an answer when the Holy Name was called upon; the matter was thereby, as with the woman, laid before God, the cause to the woman and to Jesus, to the husband and to the law, becoming a judgment or cause of God, with whom it then remained to bless or curse. In both cases the judgment was not apparent during the trial, nor was it given there and then, but it followed thereafter as a sequence, a flowing issue founded on the trial.

11. The swelling of the belly and the rotting of the thigh is the symbol of death and the grave. Ps. xlix. 14.

12. The bitter water enabled the woman to conceive, if innocent, for the law said, "She shall be free and shall conceive seed." Whether made a curse or made a blessing, the decision would inevitably follow, and would be from God.

13. The like test was applied to Jesus, for the charge of the High Priest was, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of God?" Hence it followed that if Jesus really were guilty of perverting the nation, or guilty of blasphemy as they presumed Him to be, then His belly would swell and His thigh would rot in the tomb;

He would not see life, but death and corruption would feed upon Him, and His name, like the woman's, would thereby become a curse among His people. But, if innocent of the things laid to His charge, then He would be free, free from the charge of sin, and from death, and not only be saved from death without seeing corruption, but this other token of innocence would also be given, as to the woman, so to Jesus, they both would have a seed.

14. It was corruption or conception that settled the matter. When the woman returned to "her house and her husband, it was to bear iniquity and die, or to bear a child and live. So with Jesus, as the witness of the truth; if He was the Christ according to His own confession, then the only sign given, and the only sign necessary was that of the prophet Jonas, hence for him it was either death and corruption, or life and incorruptibility.

15. The woman conceiving, if innocent, and its bearing upon Jesus, may have been perceived even by the prophet Isaiah. He writes at least with the idea in his mind of the Christ, and says, "He shall see a seed, he shall prolong days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands." Isaiah liii. 10. So in Psalm xxii. 30, 31, "A seed shall serve him, it (or they) shall be counted to the Lord for a generation." Psalm xiv. 16, 17. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name that is above every name. See also Acts iv. 12, Phil. ii. 10, 11.

---

## OBADIAH AND HIS SINGLE CHAPTER.

SOME writers, both among the Jews and Gentiles, have conjectured that Obadiah the prophet was the same as Obadiah who was servant to Ahab, king of Israel, who distinguished himself so honourably in saving the prophet from the fury of Jezebel, Ahab's wife.

Dr. Gray, in his Key to the Old Testament, makes the following remarks: "This prophet has furnished us with no particulars of his origin or life, any more than of the period in which he was favoured by the Divine revelations. That he received a commission to prophecy is evident, as well from the admission of his work into the sacred canon, as from the completion\* of those predictions which he delivered.

(\* It will be seen that part of the prophecy is still unfulfilled).

"It is probable that he flourished about the same time with Ezekiel and Jeremiah, and the best opinions concur in supposing him to have prophesied a little after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, which happened about the year of the world 3416. He predicted, therefore, the same circumstances which those prophets had foretold against the Edomites, who had upon many occasions favoured the enemies of Judah, and who, when strangers carried their forces away captive, and foreigners cast lots upon Jerusalem had rejoiced at the destruction, and insulted the children of Judah in their affliction. Ver. 11-14; Psalm lxxxvii. 7.

"The prophet, after describing the pride and cruelty of the Edomites, declares that though they dwelt in fancied security among the clefts of the rocks, yet the 'men of Teman should be dismayed,' and 'every one of the Mount of Esau should be cut off by slaughter,' and that the men who had confederated with them against Jacob, and been supported by them as their allies, should inflict the punishment of their malevolence. The prophet concludes with consolatory assurances of future restoration and prosperity to the Jews, to whom should arise deliverance from Zion; saviours, who should judge its nations; and a spiritual kingdom, appropriated and consecrated to the Lord.

"The prophet's work is short, but composed with much beauty; it unfolds a very interesting scene of prophecy, and an instructive lesson against human confidence and malicious exultation."

Though Obadiah's prophecy is the shortest of all the prophecies, "it is composed," as Dr. Gray observes, "with much beauty." The third and fourth verses shew this in a particular manner. The burden of the vision has reference to Edom, addressing whom the prophet writes: - "The pride of thine heart hath deceived thee, thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rocks, whose habitation is high; that saith in his heart, Who shall bring me down to the ground? Though thou exalt thyself as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stag's, thence will I bring thee down, saith the Lord." This figure of the eagle's nest among the stars is strong and exquisitely beautiful. Humanly speaking it signifies the impregnable security of the people of Edom inhabiting the rocky heights of Idumea; but when Jehovah stirs up one nation to dislodge another for their unpardonable iniquities, there are no longer any difficulties which cannot be overcome.

Another prophet slightly varies the words, but loses none of the beauty and strength of our seer. "Thy terribleness hath deceived thee, and the pride of thy heart, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock,

that boldest the height of the hill: though thou shouldst make thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the Lord.” Jer. xlix. 16.

The arousing of the Chaldeans for the invasion of Edom is set forth in the following graphic style: “We have heard a rumour from the Lord, and an ambassador is sent among the heathen, Arise ye, and let us go up against her in battle.” Chap. xlix. 14.

This puts Jehovah in the position of a challenger, calling aloud for war from His enemies, and He is sometimes pictured as encouraging them by a fine irony to put forth all their skill in defence.

Obadiah declares that the Lord had resolved to make the house of Esau “small among the heathen,” and “greatly despised.” And as though he had passed through her cities after the sack and flight of the inhabitants, finding nothing but desolation and dreadful silence, he breaks out into this exclamation, “How art thou cut off! How are the things of Esau searched out! How are his hidden things sought up!” If thieves had come in, or robbers by night, they would have stolen only till they had enough. Grape-gatherers would surely have left a sprinkling of fruit on the trees: but the invaders of Edom had no mercy, their greediness could not be satisfied. They have taken all; they have left only the slaughtered men, women, and children, lying in the streets.

The prophet Ezekiel foretold the invasion of the kingdom of Esau with all that vehemence of manner which is characteristic of his writings. It is best read in his own words.

“Son of man, set thy face against Mount Seir, and prophesy against it, and say unto it, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O Mount Seir, I am against thee, and I will stretch out mine hand against thee, and will make thee most desolate. I will lay thy cities waste, and thou shall be desolate, and thou shall know that I am the Lord. I will fill his mountains with his slain, in thy hills, and in thy valleys, and in all thy rivers, shall they fall that are slain with the sword. I will make thee perpetual desolations, and thy cities shall not return: and ye shall know that I am the Lord.” Chap. xxxv. The chief cities of Idumea were Teman and Bozrah. The desolation was spread as far as Dedan. It almost appears from some passages that the Edomites had subdued the Arabians, and the two peoples were fused into one.

Joel and Amos join their prophecies to those of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Obadiah, concerning the overthrow of Edom. To the prophecy of Isaiah on this subject there seems to be a second meaning which agrees with that enlarged view of Obadiah, to be considered when we arrive at the conclusion of his prophecy. At present we direct attention to the causes of this dreadful overthrow of all the southern part of Palestine.

**First,** - We borrow from the celebrated French expositor, Augustine Calmet, whose excellent comments are not impaired by the fact that he was a member of that branch of the Great Harlot system known as the French Benedictines. Upon the perpetual hatred between the people of Edom and the House of Israel he remarks: -

“The enmity of the Edomites and the Jews had begun, as it were, in the womb of their common mother. This was afterwards aggravated by other griefs, and though Jacob’s prudent calmness softened it for a time, yet their descendants did not fail to perpetuate their quarrel, which was always certain to be revived whenever an occasion offered. The last strong proof of this enmity was given by the Edomites at the siege of Jerusalem, when they afflicted the Jews, already oppressed by the Chaldeans.”

**Secondly,** - William South (not Bishop South), in his Commentary on the Prophetical Books of the Old Testament, makes the following notice: -

“The Idumeans, being the posterity of Esau, bore an ancient grudge against the Jews, on account of their ancestor’s losing his right of primogeniture and the subduing of Edom by David afterwards. Upon both these accounts they took all opportunities of venting their spite towards the Jewish nation particularly. The ill will they showed them in the time of their captivity was very remarkable, as appears by those pathetic words of Ps. cxxxvii. 7, ‘Remember the children of Edom, O Lord, in the day of Jerusalem, how they said, Down with it, down with it, even to the ground.’ “

**Thirdly,** - We take the testimony of the prophet Ezekiel, “Because thou hast had a perpetual hatred, and hast shed the blood of the children of Israel by the force of the sword in the time of their calamity. Because thou hast said, These two nations and these two countries shall be mine.”

That is to say, the Edomites thought to seize upon the lands of Israel and Judah after they were spoiled by the Assyrian and Babylonian powers, whom they had assisted in the work of ruin. The prophet points out that in their “anger” and their “envy” the Edomites had “boasted “ against God, had “spoken blasphemous words against the mountains of Israel, saying, They are laid desolate, they are given us to consume.” Chap. xxxv.

**Fourthly,** - Joel saith, “Edom shall be a desolate wilderness, for the violence against the children of Judah, because they have shed innocent blood in their land” Chap. iii. 19.

**Fifthly**, - Amos testifies, saying, "Thus saith the Lord, for three transgressions of Edom, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because he did pursue his brother with the sword, and did cast off all pity, and his anger did tear perpetually, and he kept his wrath for ever." Chap. i. 11.

**Sixthly**, - We adduce the statement of our prophet: "For thy violence against thy brother Jacob, shame shall cover thee, and thou shall be cut off for ever. In the day that thou stoodest on the other side, in the day that the strangers carried away captive his forces, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou wast one of them. Thou hast spoken proudly in the day of distress; thou hast laid hands on their substance in the day of their calamity; thou hast stood in the cross-way to cut off those that did escape; and hast delivered up those that did remain in the day of distress."

Here is the indictment against the House of Esau. Nations and individuals may gather from it a useful lesson. Jehovah treats Edom as a murderer - a hater of his brother.

From the fifteenth verse to the end of his chapter, the prophet seems to take a very comprehensive and final view of his nation, and all their enemies, whom he includes in the name Esau. It should seem that all the heathen who are hostile to Jehovah and His ancient people are here as elsewhere, represented by the name Esau, who is Edom [Rimon]. "The day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen." And again, "the house of Esau shall be for stubble."

Dr. Stokes, \* in his Paraphrastical Explication of the twelve minor prophets, makes the following remark on the sixteenth verse: - "As you of Edom shall drink of the cup of my indignation, upon, or rather because of, my holy mountain, and the holy land of Judea, which you have persecuted, so shall those nations, that joined with you in your offences, ever taste of the same cup, till they have drunk it up, and be as if they had never been."

(\* Dr. Stokes died in 1669).

This observation points out that all the unrepentant enemies of Israel will be destroyed with fire and sword, after the manner in which Nebuchadnezzar devoured the Idumeans of old. It also recognises the extinction of the wicked in the day of Israel's last deliverance.

Concerning the punishment of Edom, Newton has the following instructive paragraph: - "We know little more of the history of the Edomites than as it is connected with that of the Jews; and where is the name or the nation now? They were swallowed up and lost partly among the Nabathean Arabs, and partly among the Jews; and the very name was abolished and disused about the first century after Christ. Thus were they rewarded for insulting and oppressing their brethren, the Jews; and hereby were fulfilled the prophecies of Jeremiah and the other prophets."

In both books of the Maccabees the defeat of the Idumeans after the Babylonian captivity is mentioned: "Now when the nations round about heard that the altar was built, and the sanctuary renewed as before, it displeased them very much. Wherefore they sought to destroy the generation of Jacob that was among them, and thereupon began to slay and destroy the people. Then Judas fought against the children of Esau in Idumea, at Arabattine, because they besieged Israel; and he gave them a great overthrow, and abated their courage, and took their spoils." First Book, v. 1-3.

"But when Gorgias was governor of the holds, he hired soldiers, and nourished war continually with the Jews; and therewithal the Idumeans having gotten into their hands the most commodious holds, kept the Jews occupied, and receiving those that were banished from Jerusalem, they went about to nourish war. Then they that were with Maccabeus made supplication, and besought God that He would be their helper, and so they ran with violence upon the strongholds of the Idumeans, and assaulting them strongly, they won the holds, and kept off all that fought upon the wall, and slew all that fell into their hands, and killed no fewer than twenty thousand. And because certain who were no less than nine thousand fled together into two very strong castles, having all manner of things convenient to sustain the siege, Maccabeus left Simon and Joseph, and Zaccheus also, and them that were with him, who were enough to besiege them, and departed himself into those places which more needed his help." Second Book, x. 14-19. The date of these events is given 164-5 B.C.

This great deliverance of Jacob from the hand of his brother Esau was evidently an earnest of a much greater deliverance by Christ and they that will be with Him out of the hand of all his enemies, signs of which deliverance are peeping through the eastern sky.

"They of the south," Obadiah wrote, "shall possess the Mount of Esau; and they of the plain the Philistines; and they shall possess the fields of Ephraim, and the fields of Samaria; and Benjamin shall possess Gilead. And the captivity of this host of the children of Israel shall possess that of the Canaanites, even unto Zarephath; and the captivity of Jerusalem which is in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the south. And saviours shall come up on Mount Zion to judge the Mount of Esau, and the kingdom shall be the Lord's."

This prediction was fulfilled but partially in those wars previously spoken of. What happened then cannot be considered as coming up to the terms of the prophecy. The valiant generals who led the Hebrew troops were in their language sometimes styled "saviours." Othniel, the son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother, who delivered Israel from the hand of Cushan-Rishathaim after a servitude of eight years, is called a "saviour" in the Hebrew tongue.

As before remarked, Bozrah and Teman were the principal cities of the land of Edom, and it is from the direction of both these that the Hebrew prophets had the grandest views of Deliverers coming upon Jerusalem in "the great day of Jacob's trouble," so great that none is like it.

The prophet Habakkuk, catching a glimpse of "the pillars of the smoke coming out of the wilderness," suddenly burst forth into a poetical description, in diction hardly less splendid than the subject itself: - "God came\* from Teman, and the Holy One from Paran.\*\* His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of His praise."

(\* Dr Thomas, in Eureka, has observed that the original verb is in the future tense, 'shall come in.')

(\*\* Parn is part of Arabia Petrea).

Habakkuk observes that the approaching Colossus "stood, and measured the earth; he beheld and drove asunder the nations, and the everlasting mountains were scattered; the perpetual hills did bow, His ways are everlasting.

The mountain chains of Midian trembled before His tread, as at an earthquake. The prophet was terror-stricken at the sight. He says "When I heard, my belly trembled; my lips quivered at the voice."

While surveying in the direction of Bozrah, the prophet Isaiah had his attention arrested by a Great Warrior travelling towards him. In surprise he shouted, "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? This that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength?" And the voice answered, "I that speak in righteousness, mighty to save."

In that sublime poem of Isaiah's, consisting of the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth chapters, he describes the same scene in the vicinity of Bozrah: - "The sword of the Lord is filled with blood, it is made fat with fatness, and with the blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of the kidney of rams; for the Lord hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea. For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompense for the controversy of Zion."

The prophet closes his poem with the following beautiful lines, indicative of the fact that the smoke of war has vanished away; that the land is in peace; that He who trod His foes like grapes in the wine-press, is now beheld like rain coming gently down on the mown grass, and as showers that water the earth: - "No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon; it shall not be found there; but the redeemed shall walk there; and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."

Edom signifies red, and Bozrah a vintage, so that the very names of these cities are in harmony with Jehovah's vengeance, past and future, for the salvation of His people.

EDITOR.

---

## REFERENCE TABLET, No. 4. BY W.

(Continued from April, page 22)

### WHO SHALL BE GREATEST?

1. - Jesus laid it down as a principle, that whosoever would be greatest must be servant of all: that is, he who humbled himself now shall be exalted. Mark x. 44, Matt. xxiii. 12.
- 2.- Jesus is the greatest personage that ever did, or ever will, appear upon earth (Melchisedec not excepted), for He was not only the Son of the Highest, but was also the Representative of the Most High. Luke i. 32, Gen. xiv. 18.
3. - Jesus was greater than Jonah, greater than Solomon, and greater than Jacob. Matt. xii. 41, 42, John iv. 12, 14.
4. - Jesus was greater than David, for He was David's hope, David's desire, and David's Lord. 2 Sam. xxiii. 5, Psalm ex. 1.
5. - Jesus was greater than Abraham, for that patriarch desired to see his Lord's day; he did see it and it gladdened his heart. John viii. 56.

6. - Jesus was wiser than Solomon, therefore He will shine as the brightness of the firmament for ever and ever. Dan. xii. 3.
7. - Among all the bright stars in God's new creation Jesus will be the largest and most brilliant, for He will be the Sun, the Centre, and Foundation of the whole system. Psalm xcvi. 9.
8. - Jesus said, "Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist." Matt. xi. 11.
9. - Jesus was greater than John, because (notwithstanding the above statement) the least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than He. Matt. xi. 11.
10. - It was God's intention that Jesus should be the greatest in His Kingdom, therefore He sent Him to be the least and the servant of all. Mark x. 45.
11. - In God's Kingdom there will be various grades of Rulers represented by the adjectives, great, greater, greatest; high, higher, highest.
12. - The adjectives, little, less, least; low, lower, lowest, represent in the present, the sphere each star, will, in the future, occupy in the new Heavens of God's Creation.
13. - The height or greatness a person may attain will be determined by the condescension, the humility displayed during probation.
14. - Jesus will be the Highest, the Greatest: because He made Himself the lowest, the least, during His probation.
15. - Jesus made Himself of no reputation, in order to take away that which was disreputable in us. Phil. ii. 7.
16. - Jesus was found (having been made) in fashion as a man for the express purpose of humbling Himself, even unto death, on our account." Phil. ii. 8.
17. - Jesus took the form of a servant, doing service for us, even to the extent of bringing us out of death, in Adam, into the life which is in Himself.
18. - Jesus made Himself a slave, even unto death (i.e. sin's consequence) in order to set us free from both sin and its consequences.
19. - Jesus was, in all things, like His brethren, as to nature and constitution, but He was not like us under sentence to die for His own sins, but He was under obedience to die for our's. His object being to prevent that sentence from coming into effect against us.
20. - Jesus served us to such an extent as to do for us what we, neither collectively nor individually, could do for ourselves or others, for we were all in the same condemnation.
21. - Jesus was rich, and not for His own, but for our sakes, became poor; but He did not overdo it, or we, through His poverty, could never be made rich. 2 Cor. viii. 9.
22. - Had Jesus gone to such a depth in poverty as to have been included in the sentence passed upon all men, in Adam, He would have been one of those poverty-stricken individuals who could not, by any means, redeem his brother. Psalm xlix. 6, 7.
23. - Jesus having complied with the conditions laid down (being the servant of all); God, His Father, has already highly exalted Him, and given Him a name above all names, and, in the future, every knee shall bow to Him, and every tongue shall confess that He is the Lord (supreme, greatest ruler) to the glory of God, His Father. Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11.

-----

## PSALM XXIX.

GIVE to Jehovah, ye sons of the strong!  
 Give to Him glory and strength, and acclaim  
 The honour and blessing that only belong  
 To His holy and fearful and glorious name.

The voice of Jehovah in thunder shall sound,  
 And cause many waters to hear and obey,  
 Its echoes shall reach into earth's farthest bound,  
 And the shadows of darkness shall vanish away.

The voice of Jehovah in power reveals,  
The word of the truth of the Gospel of peace;  
The voice of Jehovah in glory unseals  
The riches of glory which never shall cease.

The voice of Jehovah has broken the cedars  
Of Sirion and Lebanon, stately and tall;  
The voice of Jehovah, to Israel's leaders,  
Proclaims, in like manner, like rebels shall fall.

The voice of Jehovah, dividing its fire,  
Shall flame forth in judgment, and work out His will,  
The desert shall tremble in face of His ire  
The desert of Kadesh shall know and be still.

The voice of Jehovah, as Judah's great Lion,  
Shall make hidden places to travail and bear,  
And forests to spring up in beauty for Zion,  
"And all in His temple His glory declare."

Jehovah shall sit on the deluge and reign,  
Jehovah shall sit for an age as the King,  
Jehovah in strength will His people sustain,  
And bless them in peace, while they worship and sing.  
D.B.

-----

## EXTRACT

### MATTHEW XXVII. 9. - "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the Prophet."

This quotation of what appears to be a prophecy of Jeremiah, is attended with considerable difficulty. In our present copies of Jeremiah we have no such words. How then are we to reconcile the assertion of Matthew, that this was a prophecy of Jeremiah's, with the fact that no such prophecy is contained in Jeremiah? Were the manuscripts which the apostles possessed different from our own? Or has this word Ἰερεμίας (Jeremias), crept into the manuscript copies of the Gospel? Or is it a mistake of the transcribers, who wrote Ἰερεμίας instead of Ζεξάπιος? Or can it be accounted for by any other fact, so as to make the present text true? Some critics would have us believe that the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of the book of the prophet Zechariah (where the prophecy is found), as it now stands, were written by Jeremiah. But as the authority of, I think, all the ancient manuscripts is adverse to this, the supposition, though ably maintained, falls to the ground; (see Dr. Hammond on Heb. viii. 9. Mode's Works, pp. 786, 833. Bishop Kidder's Dem. of Messiah, part 2, p. 196; and Home's Introduction, vol. 4, p. 209.) Others, again, are of opinion that the gospel according to Matthew has in this place suffered by the carelessness of the transcribers, who have mistaken the Ζεχ for 'lep'. This is certainly supported by the authority of several manuscripts. But we should be careful how we admit this solution, if any other possible one can be found. This objection applies also to the supposition that the whole word Ἰερεμίας has crept in; and, indeed, how should we think it possible that a transcriber would insert any word into his manuscripts without knowing it to be correct? But this text will find an easy solution by the consideration that it was a custom among the Jews to divide the Old Testament into three parts; the first, beginning with the law, was called the Law; the second, beginning with the Psalms, was called the Psalms; and the third, commencing with Jeremiah, was called Jeremiah: thus the writings of Zechariah, and of the other prophets, being included in the division, which began with Jeremiah, all quotations would go by his name. This solution perfectly removes the difficulty. Dr. Lightfoot (who cites the Baba Bathea, and Rabbi David Kimchi's Preface to the prophet Jeremiah as his authorities), insists that the word Jeremiah is perfectly correct, as standing at

the head of that division from which the Evangelist quoted, and which gave its denomination to all the rest. (Horne's Introduction, II. p. 368, note 2.) CRITICA BIBLICA, vol. 1, page 466.

F. H. W.

---

## EXTRACTS BY ECLECTIC.

Kepler, (the distinguished astronomer), found by the calculations which he made that Jupiter and Saturn were in conjunction in the constellation of the Fishes (a fish is the astrological symbol of Judaea) in the latter half of the year of Rome 747, and were joined by Mars in 748. The two planets went past each other three times, came very near together, and showed themselves all night long for months, in conjunction with each other, as if they could never separate again. Their first union in the east awoke the attention of the Magi, told them the expected time had come, and bade them set off without delay towards Judaea (the fish land). When they reached Jerusalem the two planets were once more blended together. Then, in the evening, they stood in the southern part of the sky, pointing with their united rays to Bethlehem, where prophecy declared the Messiah was to be born. The Magi followed the finger of heavenly light, and were brought to the child Jesus. The conclusion, in regard to the time of the advent, is, that our Lord was born in the latter part of the year of Borne, 747, or six years before the common era.

KITTO'S Biblical Cyclopaedia, under "Star of the East."

If it be conceded that Zoroaster was under the tuition of Daniel, why should it be doubted that the Persian Sage, and those guided by his predictions were acquainted with the sign, which was to announce the birth of the "mysterious child," "born King of the Jews?" Matt. ii. 2.

It is an interesting and suggestive fact that far beyond the limits of Palestine, and among non-Israelitish peoples, the expectation of a mighty deliverer prevailed. It may be traced in the superstitions of even the North American Indians, who allege that the wondrous "Prophet, or Teacher," did once appear among them, sent by the "Great Spirit, the Master of Life," for their instruction in the arts of peace.

ECLECTIC.

---

## ON THE RESPONSIBILITY OF MEN FOR ERRORS ARISING FROM PREJUDICE.

Prejudice consists, says Dr. Johnson, in judgment formed before-hand without examination. In order to include all its shades and degrees, it might, I think, be better defined to be judgment formed in whole or in part without due examination. It is acknowledged to be a most general and fruitful source of error, and if it were allowed to be universally a legitimate excuse for the errors to which it gave birth, a very great proportion of those who embrace false systems and opinions would be sheltered from responsibility.

In order to discover whether prejudice is ever a just excuse for error, it is necessary to enquire, whether it may ever be said to be itself innocent. If innocent, its natural and necessary effects will be so also; but if always criminal, it is clear that the errors, which arise from it, must partake of its nature.

Men are led to embrace opinions without due examination.

**1stly.** - By thoughtlessness, and a want of attention and scrutiny.

**2ndly.** - By following the guidance of inclination and passion, rather than that of reason.

**3rdly** - By undue deference to authority. These, then, are the sources of prejudice, and they must be separately considered.

**1st.-** If thoughtlessness and want of attention to evidence and of industry in searching for it, were allowable pleas, multitudes who live "without God in the world," and refuse to listen to the gospel of His Son, would have a very sufficient excuse to offer. Nothing can be more clear, than that all are bound to make a good use of the faculties which God has given them. If men, therefore form opinions, and adopt principles, on light grounds, when they have ability and opportunity for more satisfactory investigation, they cannot be acquitted of blame, and are justly chargeable with the errors into which they have been led by their negligence.

**2nd** - But supposing the mind to turn earnestly to the subject of enquiry, much will depend on the temper with which it approaches it. It is evident, that whoever is desirous of deciding wisely, must reason calmly, and keep out of sight as much as possible, during the process of investigation, both his wishes and feelings. Numbers, however, instead of endeavouring to emancipate themselves from their influence, when examining principles of conduct, take them for their guides, and make little use of reason but to defend and vindicate the conclusions to which these guides lead them. Now, except it be allowable to pervert the faculty of reason, and thereby to be guilty of a greater abuse of the divine bounty, than he was, who hid his talent in a napkin; such a procedure cannot be innocent, nor consequently the errors to which it leads. This is true even when the best affections are indulged to the degradation of reason. When the worst are suffered to assume the reins, and lead the understanding captive, the guilt is, of course prodigiously aggravated.

But even when the predominant wish is not, as in the case which has been considered, to indulge inclination, but to discover the truth, and to avoid everything likely to bewilder and mislead in the search after it, the affections of the heart will generally interfere more or less in the province of reason, and often in so great a degree as to lead to very important prejudices and errors.

Even in the most sincere and devoted servants of Christ the conquest over the lust's of the flesh is gradual . . . The Christian is liable to be misled in his reasonings, not only by unhallowed affections but by those which are more spiritual . . . It would be easy to show by familiar instances that parental and conjugal love, the love of a people for their minister, and other amiable affections . . . are very commonly pregnant sources of prejudice. Scripture affords many instances in point. What prejudiced Moses against the office God assigned him, of going to his countrymen as a deliverer? Chiefly, as it would seem, his humility. What induced Peter to call in question the propriety of the Divine command, to kill and eat of the animals let down to him in the great sheet in his vision? His Love of that system of purity, which his God, whom he loved, had established. What led the disciples of Christ so long to question and disbelieve His declarations, that He should suffer death and rise again? Their warm love for their Divine Master was a leading cause of their unbelief.

The young and the sanguine, especially while Christian affections are yet new to them, are apt to give the reins to their feelings. They are but imperfectly aware how necessary it is that they should be restrained when reason is called upon to investigate and decide; and the restraint is so irksome to them, that, imperfect as their theory may be on this point, their practice is far more imperfect.

It surely would be too much to say, that prejudices of the class which has last been under consideration, are blameless. If they were, it would not be a duty (as it clearly is) to strive against them.

**3rd.** - Those prejudices, which may be ascribed to undue deference to authority, are next to be considered.

A great part of human knowledge rests on authority as its proper basis. History in all its branches, whether of past or of present times, can have scarcely any other foundation. In matters of science also, and in almost all subjects which require much research, the great mass of mankind can neither obtain knowledge, nor form opinions, but (chiefly if not entirely) on the ground of authority. If, therefore in settling points of duty, an improper reliance is not placed on this source of knowledge, nor on the opinions derived from it; and if recourse is had to such other means of information as are accessible to the enquirer, all is well. No more than a proper and legitimate use is made of authority, and a man is not responsible for the errors into which it may lead him: indeed, opinions so formed and held ought not to be denominated prejudices. The examination on which they are founded forms a basis sufficiently broad for their support.

But reverse the case, and the conclusion, as to the responsibility of the individual, must be reversed also. An opinion which rests on a blind or undue deference to authority, is evidently destitute of a just foundation; and, if erroneous, the error is chargeable on those who entertain it. Their criminality will vary according to circumstances, and vary very greatly; but still, under all circumstances, they must be pronounced guilty of not having made a proper use of their reason.

Thus, prejudices having their rise in thoughtlessness and want of attention, or in the influence of passion or inclination, or in an improper deference to authority; the errors to which they give birth, though by no means all equally culpable, yet all bear the stamp of criminality more or less deeply impressed . . . The world is disposed to "call evil good" when she does not conceive her own interests to be concerned; let Christians be on their guard against the contagion of her example. While they watch over themselves with a holy jealousy, and are exact "their own defects to scan," let them cherish a warm love for all their fellow creatures, and entertain as favourable an opinion of others as circumstances will admit: but, at the same time, let them steadily maintain right principles in their full extent, and never compliment man by softening down any part of the law of God. - R. S.

The Christian Observer, July 1803, pp. 403, 406.  
ECLECTIC.

## INTELLIGENCE.

**BIRMINGHAM** - We are in the receipt of two letters forwarded by Bro. Jones, Secretary of the Ecclesia now meeting in Broad Street and while fully sympathizing with those brethren, we do not feel justified in publishing in extenso the rather lengthy communications which have passed between them and those assembling in the Temperance Hall on the subject of their separation and allied matters, fearing they might not prove sufficiently interesting to the majority of our readers. The main facts of the case have, indeed, already appeared in our intelligence columns.

**CULLEN, SCOTLAND**, April 12th, 1874. - Dear Bro. Turney, - I am rejoiced to be able to announce that since the date of my last intelligence to the Lamp, which was wholly of a personal character, there are five of the eleven brethren and sisters in this quarter who can intelligently say with me, "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He (Jesus) laid down His life for us," and who believe that He was in the true sense of the term free-born; that He was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, and therefore had no need to offer for His own sins, but for ours only. We have also a brother and sister who sympathize with us in thus believing to such an extent that they consider themselves justified in assembling with us for the commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Captain of our Salvation in the Divinely appointed way, and we do not consider ourselves at liberty to refuse their fellowship, seeing that we believe in common that Jesus came in the flesh and died in our human nature to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself, Two of the six who are altogether united in the belief of the truth, have, owing to physical causes over which they have no control, been unable to assemble with us as yet. This accounts for all, with the exception of three who have hitherto refused to hold intercourse with us in any form. We look forward with longing, and pray - in which we are doubtless joined by all the faithful in Christ Jesus - that the time may soon come when God our Father shall turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent; when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. And to the end that we may individually be made participants in the glorious disposition of things which shall then obtain, let us see to it that we now strive to all speak the same thing that there be no divisions among us, but that we be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. Let us stand fast in one spirit with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel. - GEO. LILLIE.

**DEAL** - Brother David Brown writes,- Having run down to Deal for a refreshing during the Easter holidays, and to help on the small ecclesia here to continue faithful in the faithful Word I have much pleasure in reporting that the few members who form the congregation abide in the doctrine of the Christ, holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, though manifested in the likeness of sin's flesh, and they rejoice the more in this scriptural view when they see the contradictions and absurdities the advocates of the contrary doctrine fall into in their vain attempts to prove that our blessed Lord was accused either as a constitutional sinner, or as an actual transgressor of the Mosaic Law, to fulfil the will of God. The Lamp is greatly appreciated by them, and materially assists to enlighten and strengthen them in the knowledge of the deep things of God, and the things whereby one may edify another. They wish it God speed, and will do all in their power to commend it to the regard of all seekers after righteousness. The hindrances to their weekly communions are now in a great measure removed, and I trust they will strive together for the truth of the gospel, and for their own up-building in their most holy faith, in the unity of the spirit and in the bond of peace, with increased zeal, and patience of hope; and so much the more as they see the day approaching. I commend them to the prayers of the brethren of all the ecclesias, with myself also, and remain, dear brother, ever faithfully yours in the love and truth of the Gospel of the grace of God."

**LEICESTER**, April 14th, 1874. - Dear Editor and Brother, - I have pleasure in asking you to record in the forthcoming issue of the Lamp, the immersion of Mr. Frederick Taylor (27), boot and shoe manufacturer, who put on the saving name in the appointed way on the 2nd inst. Mr. Taylor has been for some considerable time a frequent (I may say regular) attendant at the Lectures delivered in the interest of the truth during the past twelve months, and has come to the conclusion that if salvation is to be obtained there is but one way revealed, and by identifying himself with us, he has signified that the way we endeavour to point out to those who will give ear is that only way. May he hold fast thereto nothing wavering. Since my last communication, the Lectures we have given have been on the whole well attended, Bro.' Ellis, of Nottingham, having lectured twice for us. On the first occasion he dealt with Spiritualism, which drew together a very good and attentive audience. On the following Sunday he took the question of the "Sacrifice of Christ: did He offer for Himself as well as for those He came to redeem?" The only regret was that our friends of the opposition did not put in an appearance, for their own behoof or

else to make manifest that what the Lecturer advanced was not in accord with the Book. We have just completed the arrangement for Three Lectures on consecutive Sundays; by Bro. Handley on the 19th, Bro. Hayes on the 26th, and Bro. Nichols on May 3rd; hope they may with God's blessing prosper the cause of truth. We have also made arrangements for lecturing at Loughborough; the campaign will be opened by two lectures by Bro. Handley on Monday and Tuesday evenings, April 20th and 21st. The first will be on the popular doctrine concerning the Devil and Hell; and the second proposes to answer the question, "Do the Clergy preach the same Gospel as did Jesus and His Apostles?" It is intended, God willing, to follow these up by a lecture on Sunday evenings till further notice, and with this view a very desirable room has been secured = the Lecture Room in the Town Hall, accommodating about 300 persons. The subscribers to the Lamp all express themselves satisfied that the name and matter well sustain each other - Shine on!  
Yours in the one hope,  
CHAS. WEALE.

**LONDON.** - The Hall, Church Street, Islington. - On the first Sunday in this month, we had the privilege of a visit from Bro. Ellis, who was present at our meeting morning and evening; and he gave the evening lecture. The subject happily selected was the popular doctrine of the "Devil." The subject just now is one of considerable importance, for I believe there are not a few in the Christadelphian community who still hold this popular doctrine, which the Apostle Paul, in his epistle to Timothy, clearly denounces as "a departure from the faith." 1 Timothy iv. 1. Some minds are not clear upon this, forgetful for the time being how dishonouring it is to the great work for which the Son of God was manifested, "that He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the Devil." The discourse was well given, and may certainly be said to be as clear and convincing exposition of the whole subject as could be desired, and will no doubt prove profitable to all who heard it. There were many strangers present, who appeared to be deeply interested. Last Sunday, the 12th, Bro. Nichols in the evening delivered a lecture on the same subject, "The Devil," expounding the scripture doctrine upon it, with much original argument. Several strangers present seemed to be greatly interested in "this new doctrine" concerning the "Devil" so clearly presented to their minds, doubtless for the first time. May these lectures conduce to the profit of all, not only to ourselves, but to the stirring up of a spirit of enquiry in the minds of the few visitors present, that they may search the Scriptures for themselves to see whether those things be so or not. The subject for next Sunday evening's lecture, D.V. to be delivered by Bro. Nichols, will be the kindred doctrine of "Hell" -

Yours fraternally in the truth, D. BROWN.

**MALDON.**- Bro. C. Handley writes, "I am very pleased to tell you that our Sunday evening lectures have been more successful of late. Several have been induced to come and hear, and one or two are interested. We spent a very pleasant day with Bro. Watts on Sunday, the 12th inst. Our prayer is that, while one plants and another watereth, the Lord will give the increase."

**MUMBLES,** April 14th, 1874. - Dear Brother, - A very interesting case has transpired here. A young man, by name Richard Bennett, who was dipped in water by the condemnationists (or Adamites, as I call them) about twelve months ago, having heard the glorious doctrine of an uncondemned Christ, and being rather an independent thinker, took the Apostle John's advice of trying the spirits, to see whether they are of God, and while reading both sides of the question was told by the Adamites not to read the Christadelphian Lamp. This, I consider, is like following the Papacy. He desisted from breaking bread with them, but attended all their other meetings, which caused discussions and contentions to arise between them. Would you believe that the secretary of the Adamites wrote to Richard. for publication in his Magazine for March the following, page 145 : - "I am happy to inform you that we at the Mumbles continue firm and contented in the faith, and strongly constrained to hold it fast with a firm grasp" etc., when at the same time this young man had not broken bread for four Sundays in consequence of this doctrine. This young man being fully satisfied that they were wrong in believing in a condemned Christ, and seeing this untruthful report, became so thoroughly disgusted with their conduct, both doctrinally and morally, that he sent in his resignation. On Saturday evening last we had the pleasure of immersing him in a new baptistery, which we have fixed in the school-room behind the Synagogue, so putting him into the uncondemned Christ of the Scriptures. By coming among us he has sold all his youthful companions that were with them, thus following the exhortation of Paul in his second letter to the Corinthians, 6 chap. 17 and 18 verses. Our meetings are well attended, and we believe that very soon others will follow the above example. Yours in the one hope,  
WILLIAM CLEMENT.

**NEATH,** April 14th. - Dear Brother, - "We have been looking over the great and glorious doctrine of the uncondemned Christ brought to light by Bro. Handley, and nobly contended for by Bro. Turney in his discussion with Mr. C. Smith, and also in his lecture at Birmingham, which we have read with profit and pleasure, and are now fully convinced that such is the teaching of the Word of God. On Sunday, April 5th, we had a cheering visit from Bro. W. Clement, who is, as usual, full of zeal and love for the truth. He

spoke, after the breaking of bread, for about three quarters of an hour, on the four laws spoken of by Paul in the 8th chap. of Romans, 2, 3, and 4 verses, and clearly demonstrated that the law spoken of in the 3rd verse does not mean what the Condemnationists (or Adamites, as he calls them) say it means, but that the law there spoken of is the sacrificial law of Moses, which could not, in consequence of the weakness thereof, take away sin. He quoted as proof the 13th chapter 39th verse of the Acts, Hebrews 9th chapter 9th verse, and the 10th chapter from the 1st to the 12th verse. At night he lectured on "Christ a new creation," commencing in the womb of the Virgin, by the power of God, therefore not full of sin, but full of grace and truth, as stated by John. We should be right glad to see his face and hear his voice oftener - Yours in the blessed hope, SAML. HEARD.

**NOTTINGHAM.** - There have been four immersions since our last report, as follows: - Amelia Eliza Smedley, 22, neutral, wife of Bro. Smedley, whose immersion was announced last month; Thomas Greasley, 63, and his wife Mary Ann, 62, the father and mother of Sister Overton, both formerly neutral; and William Smedley, 35, baker, formerly neutral; not related to the Sister Smedley announced above. The following lectures have been delivered in the Synagogue on Sunday evenings: - March 22nd, Pilate's question "What is Truth?" Bro. Hayes. March 29th, "Obedience to the Gospel, its superiority over the Law - the danger of its rejection," Bro. Nichols of London. April 5th, "Heaven going and Hell going, as popularly taught, a delusion," Bro. Hayes. April 12th, "The Spiritualism of the Bible destructive of the vagaries of the Spiritualists," Bro. Ellis. Easter Monday being a general holiday was taken advantage of by the brethren to hold a tea meeting, which resulted in a very pleasant evening being spent. Just about a hundred sat down to tea, the number being subsequently increased to about 130. Several interested friends were present, who expressed themselves well pleased with the proceedings. After tea short addresses were given to those assembled by Brethren Hayes, Ellis, Richmond, Godkin, and Liggett, and hymns and anthems were sung at intervals.

**STOURBRIDGE.** - Bro. F. Turney writes as follows: - "We are glad to be able to report two additions to our number this month, viz., Henry Hammonds, and his daughter, Emily Hammonds, who put on the saving name of Christ by immersion on Wednesday, April 8th. This encourages us to persevere, looking to God for the increase. On Sunday, April 5th, we had Brother Handley with us, who lectured in the evening on "The Jailer's question, and Paul's answer;" - showing that previous to the jailer's immersion Paul "preached unto him the Word of the Lord," or the gospel, and that it is only by a faith in this Word made perfect by obedience, that we can be justified in God's sight. On the following day (Easter Monday) we had a social tea meeting, at which were present some 45 brethren and sisters and friends. After tea Bro. Turner, from Birmingham, presided, and gave an interesting address. An opportunity was next given for friends to ask questions. Bro. Handley occupied the rest of the evening, specially dwelling on the object and consequent importance of the "true baptism." Suitable anthems were sung at intervals.

[Foreign Intelligence crowded out]