

# The Christadelphian Lamp

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

Vol. 1.

JUNE, 1874

No. 8.

---

## CONTENTS

Page 2	A Treatise on the Two Sons of God (Continued)	Editor
Page 8	Letters to The Editor	
Page 13	Questions by	Brother James Grant
Page 14	Questions by	Brother Thomas Williams
Page 15	The First and Second Adams (Continued)	Brother John Butler
Page 18	The Glorification of The Christ	Brother David Brown
Page 19	Still On Thou Loving Heart (Poem)	
Page 20	The Only Begotten Son of God	Brother W.A. Harris
Page 22	Answers to Correspondents	W.E.
Page 23	Note on Matthew X. 15	Scrutator
Page 23	The Signs of The Times	Brother S.G.Hayes
Page 25	Intelligence	
Page 27	Extracts from Foreign Letters	

-----

"Hosea was commanded to take unto himself a wife, who should literally represent to the nation the crime of which they were guilty. The first child was the prophet's own son, and under the command of God was named Jezreel, which, as before stated, imports "seed of God." It should seem that the other two were illegitimate, and symbolize the cast-off and the restored Jewish nation. Herein also the great condescension and forgiveness of the Almighty is strikingly taught, inasmuch as He permits His unfaithful wife to return to His lost favor on conditions of repentance. Nay, He is even described as pitifully alluring her to return and dwell with Him in faithfulness and peace.

Jezreel, the prophet's own son, stood as the "seed of God" before his nation, and was the representative of that portion of it who obeyed the commands of Jehovah. It appears somewhat significant that a personage styled the "seed of God" should be appointed to mark out the highest attainment of obedience to God. In short, this fact at once brings to mind the burden of Scripture that God had declared He would have a Seed or Son, in whom He should be well pleased. And it is hereby suggested that while this Seed of God should be manifested in the nature of his brethren, he would be far above them all in his relationship, being God's own and only child."

-----

**"Without faith it is impossible to please Him;  
for he that cometh to God must believe that He is,  
and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."**

**Hebrews 11:6**

# A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD

(Continued from May, page 8)

## AARON AND CHRIST.

### CHAPTER IV. - Contents: Aaron and Christ - Jezreel - Beth-el - The Flesh.

THERE is no character mentioned in the Bible whose presence so fills the eye, whose appearance is so imposing, as the first high priest of the tribe of Levi. Considered as high priest, Aaron surpasses Moses in dignity. In the genealogy he is placed before him. All Aaron's sons were elevated to the priesthood, but the posterity of Moses are reckoned among the Kohathites, "who were ministers to the priests.

The exalted position of Aaron is one sign of the still higher position of Christ. In that beautiful and convincing comparison drawn by Paul in Hebrews between Aaron and Christ, we observe that one mark of Christ's superiority consists in His appointment by the oath of God. "Inasmuch as not without an oath He was made priest. By so much was Jesus made surety of a better testament." (Chap. vii. 20, 22.) "For those high priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by Him that said unto Him, The Lord swear and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek." (ver. 21.)

The Almighty's oath is as unchangeable as Himself; and the priesthood of Christ being built upon it is proof of its immutability; whereas the Aaronic priesthood not being founded on oath, was indicative of its temporary character. Therefore it is that Paul says, "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament."

This reasoning would enlighten and persuade the Jews concerning the proper position of the Mosaic covenant in the grand economy of redemption. They would be brought to see that a covenant which rested on a changeable priesthood must of necessity itself be changeable; therefore no everlasting pardon or remission could possibly be obtained by its sacrifices. But Christ was to be "perfected for evermore," in Him, therefore, they would recognise an unchangeable priest, able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him.

The Apostle declares that "such an high priest became us." This is as much as to say that the salvation of man could never have been achieved by a sinful priesthood. Paul makes this evident by his next words: "who is holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners." The excellence of Aaron's house was merely that of appointment. The excellence of Christ was intrinsic. Aaron was a sinner by birth and character, and therefore could not be a saviour. But Christ was neither. The Apostle says, "in Him was no sin." (1 John iii. 5.) He was a 'human sinless manifestation in order to take away our sins. It is this very thing that constitutes the basis of our hope. If we break in upon this arrangement our hope cannot be "sure and steadfast." Nothing short of absolute righteousness can save sinners.

Be it ever remembered that "it is the word of the oath that maketh the Son" what we have just noticed in the words of the Apostle. No man "born in sin and shapen in iniquity" could be said to be "undefiled and separate from sinners." It could not be said of such an one, "in him is no sin." Christ Jesus was "the body prepared" of the Father on which "He laid the iniquities of us all."

Between all types and the things they typify there is of necessity certain important differences. The general character of a type is relative imperfection or inferiority to its antitype. This is true of Aaron. He was a sanctified sinner, that is to say, a sinful man set apart for the service of Jehovah as the high priest of Israel. His offerings were, like himself all relatively inferior; in other words, they possessed no real power. The whole performance may be described as a dramatic rehearsal, not of a past but of a future original.

The difference betwixt Aaron's sacrifices and Christ's sacrifice has often been remarked by expositors. "In this passage," observes Macknight "the Apostle takes notice of three particulars, which distinguish the sacrifice offered by Christ from the sacrifices offered by the Jewish high priests. 1st, He offered no sacrifice for Himself, but only for the people. 2ndly, He did not offer that sacrifice annually, but once for all. 3rdly, The sacrifice which He offered for the people was not of calves and of goats but of Himself."

In allusion to the one offering, Paul writes, "for this He did once." There is a singular unanimity among all the commentators on these words. They say the sense is, "this last he did once, namely, he offered up sacrifice for the sins of the people." Both Whitby and Wells refer to the perfect agreement of all ancient expositors on this passage.

When Aaron offered sacrifice he had linen garments upon his person from head to foot. The robes on his body prefigured the perfect righteousness in Christ. The place where, as well as the condition in

which, Aaron offered, was inferior to the place where Christ offered Himself. The typical high priest presented himself in an imperfect state in a tabernacle made by man; the true High Priest entered in a perfect state into "the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man." This Paul speaks of in chap. ix. 2, as "a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this (the Mosaic) building."

The mediatorial office would not begin outside the sanctuary. Christ, therefore, could not act as our High Priest while He was on earth. "For if He were on earth He should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, see, saith He, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed thee in the mount." Heb. viii. 4; 5.

Aaron entered the holy of holies with blood; Christ entered by His own blood into heaven itself. The conscience of the faithful worshipper is purged, because of the perfection of the offering. Any moral or legal blemish in the sacrifice and the priest would leave the worshipper unpurged. He would be no better than the Israelite under Aaron; a blemished victim and a blemished offerer could never make him that did the service perfect." In preparing the body of Christ the merciful Father practically explained and solved that which to man was, and must have for ever remained, a hidden mystery. The birth, death, and resurrection of Christ, are a tangible and truly a glorious "revelation of the mystery" which had been hid for ages and generations. "In other ages," wrote Paul to the Ephesians, this mystery "was not made known to the sons of men." But the record God has given of His Son unfolds it all by patient and devout study; and the free and equal invitation to the Gentiles also explains "the fellowship of the mystery;" shewing how the Gentiles should be made fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of His promise in Christ by the gospel." He who understands these things and loves them will feel the fitness of the apostle's words when he styles them "the unsearchable riches of Christ." The Mosaic high priest and his work were "the mystery of the Christ" in symbol; and during the whole period of the existence of the symbol the solution of it was, we are told, a subject of anxious desire on the part of prophets, righteous men, and angels. The Eternal Spirit in the prophets testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ; but neither men nor angels were able to say what those sufferings signified. The birth of the Son of God was the signal for praise and joy among the angel hosts of other orbs. Gabriel, who had been commissioned by Jehovah to visit His "handmaid" in the city of Nazareth, had probably carried to them the glad tidings. It was he, perhaps, who visited the shepherds on the plains of Bethlehem to announce to them, amidst a terrible display of light, the advent of the promised seed. While anxiously watching their flocks in the awful stillness of the night, alert for the least sound indicative of the approach of lion or of wolf, "Lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them, and they were sore afraid."

The plain was wrapped in electric fire, and the white glistening figure of an angel stood in the midst and cried, "Fear not, for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be unto all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes lying in a manger."

When he had pronounced these words, "suddenly there was with the multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest heavens, and on earth peace, and good will towards men." And then the light ceased; the echoes died away among the distant hills; the startled flocks sought fresh repose on the dewy grass; the angels had gone away from them into heaven; the group of shepherds forgot their flocks, and stood a moment wondering in the starlight at what had occurred: their decision was soon taken; it was resolved to go at once into Bethlehem "and see this thing which," said they "the Lord hath made known unto us."

### JEZREEL.

The geographical and doctrinal aspects of this Hebrew name are full of interest. The city from which the famous valley of Jezreel takes its name belonged to the half tribe of Manasseh, and was situated on the west of Jordan, between latitude 32½ and longitude 35½ degrees. The valley is of vast extent, and though uncultivated, it is still very fertile. It is judged to be highly suitable for the cultivation of wheat. Thistles are said to abound in parts of it, and to reach a growth of eight feet high. Where once stood fine palaces of the kings of Israel, and rich vineyards, there the Arab finds pasture for his sheep and goats, and roams unfettered as the winds.

In Jacob's prophetic blessing the vale of Jezreel was assigned to the tribe of Issachar as part of their possession. The old seer likened his son to "a strong ass, couching down between two burdens; and he saw that rest was good, and that it was pleasant; and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute."

After two hundred years, the great captain, Joshua, stood with Jacob's sons upon "the land of promise," drawing lots for its division among the tribes. And he tells us himself that "the fourth lot came out to Issachar, for the children of Issachar according to their families." This was a grand lottery of rich prizes; and the issue of the drawing was controlled by Him who directs all things after the counsel of His own will. "Their border," which "was towards Jezreel," enclosed "sixteen cities with their villages," and "the outgoings of it were at Jordan."

No doubt Jezreel, which signifies the seed of God, stood with feverish anxiety waiting the issue of the lots. Nevertheless the whole seed were sure that whatever difference there might be as to the desirableness of their respective estates, a valuable portion somewhere in the land would fall to everyone.

Four hundred years after the holy seed had taken root in the soil of Canaan, the first king fought his last battle in this part of the country, and fell ignominiously with Jonathan, his son, on the mountains of Gilboa. The enemy cut off his head, and nailed his body to the wall of Bethsan. This sad event touched David's heart, and was the occasion of the first out-burst of the poetic fire. His generosity would not allow the least allusion to the ill-treatment he had received from Saul, but remembered him only as the Lord's anointed and Israel's valiant king. His shame at the thought of these evil tidings reaching Gath and Askelon; his passionate apostrophe to the mountains of Gilboa; his invocation to the daughters of Israel to weep over Saul; and his over-whelming distress at the memory of Jonathan's fidelity and love, make up an ode, whose strains melt the soul, and which will be admired through all time.

Jezreel, or the seed of God, is a kind of *iperium in imperio*. The entire seed was made holy by divine appointment, and separated from "the seed of men" in the universal sense. But among this chosen seed there has been in all its history but a very small proportion of it that has borne good fruit. The Jezebel section of the community has generally been in power, and even the prophets of Jehovah have been compelled to hide themselves for a season. Those who have delighted to walk after the flesh have always found some pious and plausible reason for seizing the humble vineyard of Naboth, conspiring to accuse him of treason and blasphemy, and stone him to death. Paul seems to have had the figure of a kingdom within a kingdom in his eye when he declared that "he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh, but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God. And again, when he dictated these words, "Not as though the word of God had taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel. Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children, but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed."

The prophets of Israel and their children sometimes represent the Great Prophet and His children, who are styled "the sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty." One plain instance of this is found in Hebrews, where Paul quotes the first part of the eighteenth verse of the eighth of Isaiah, in application to Jesus and His Brethren. "Behold, I and the children which God hath given me. The object of the apostle here seems to be to show that, like as the prophets' children partook of their father's nature, so Messiah was to be a partaker of the nature of his brethren; that is, of the seed of Abraham."

But the rest of the prophet's words Paul did not find occasion to cite. They bear upon a subject he did not wish then to speak upon, but which serve to illustrate what is said in the beginning of the preceding paragraph. Those words are as follow: "for signs and for wonders in Israel from the Lord of hosts, which dwelleth in Mount Zion." And if the reader will place together the meaning of the names of Isaiah's children, he will perceive that they reveal the future purpose of Jehovah to be accomplished by the holy seed with Christ at their head. Isaiah's children were for signs and wonders to be fulfilled in Israel when Christ shall come forth for Israel's deliverance with ten thousand of His saints.

A like doctrine is couched in the names of the children of the prophet Hosea; one of which names has been selected as the heading of the present article.

It will be observed that this prophet appears to hold a similar relation to his wife to that which Jehovah often chooses to employ Himself in relation to Israel. That is to say, the prophet is put in the place of God, and Gomer the prophet's wife stands for the whole nation of God's chosen seed.

When we consider the character of Gomer, her fitness as a figure of Israel at large is seen to be perfect. The Almighty pictures Himself in the prophets as having married Israel; as having loved and betrothed her to Himself when she was an outcast, a slave, and despised. No figure would more forcibly and beautifully portray the exceeding love of God, and the exalted position of the chosen seed.

Israel's crime was black in the highest degree. She was unfaithful to her husband and her Lord; she openly went after other lovers; she departed from the Husband of her youth, and courted the favours of the Assyrians, the Babylonians, and the Egyptians. This national infidelity and spiritual unchastity is described at great length by the prophets, particularly by Ezekiel in the twenty-third chapter.

Hosea was commanded to take unto himself a wife, who should literally represent to the nation the crime of which they were guilty. The first child was the prophet's own son, and under the command of God was named Jezreel, which, as before stated, imports "seed of God." It should seem that the other two were illegitimate, and symbolize the cast-off and the restored Jewish nation. Herein also the great condescension and forgiveness of the Almighty is strikingly taught, inasmuch as He permits His unfaithful wife to return to His lost favor on conditions of repentance. Nay, He is even described as pitifully alluring her to return and dwell with Him in faithfulness and peace.

Jezreel, the prophet's own son, stood as the "seed of God" before his nation, and was the representative of that portion of it who obeyed the commands of Jehovah. It appears somewhat significant that a personage styled the "seed of God" should be appointed to mark out the highest attainment of obedience to God. In short, this fact at once brings to mind the burden of Scripture that God had declared He would have a Seed or Son, in whom He should be well pleased. And it is hereby suggested that while this Seed of God should be manifested in the nature of his brethren, he would be far above them all in his relationship, being God's own and only child.

Such appears to us to be the typical value of Jezreel. No phrase could so forcibly show the descent and high standing of the Messiah as the phrase "Seed of God." No language would better imply Messiah's absolute freedom from sin. The nature in which this promised Seed appeared did not contaminate it; it was pre-eminently "the Holy Seed." All the other was only holy by appointment or adoption; this was holy from birth. The other was "the seed of the serpent," because Adam sold it all to the serpent; or, in Paul's words, it was "sold under sin." Messiah was not "the serpent's seed," but the "Seed of God." The seed of the serpent has no power to fulfil the prediction against itself; it cannot bruise its own head. Its function was to inflict an inferior wound on the "Seed of God," while the latter was to destroy it altogether. To distinguish it from "the seed of men," or "the serpent's seed," it is also styled "the seed of the woman." This is the great Seed which the Eternal promised to Abraham; and which He also promised to raise up unto David, of which Seed He said "I will be to him for a Father, and he shall be to Me for a Son."

As a consequence of the future betrothal "in faithfulness," the prophet predicts a large outflow of temporal blessings. "And it shall come to pass in that day, I will hear, saith the Lord, I will hear the heavens and they shall hear the earth; and the earth shall hear the corn, and the wine, and the oil, and they shall hear Jezreel. This figure indicates a hearing, or concurrence, or subordination, or servitude throughout all things directed by the hand of God for the advantage and comfort of His seed.

In the wording of the next verse there is an evident allusion to the meaning of the title Jezreel. "And I will sow her unto me in the earth; and I will have mercy on her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to them which were not my people, Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God."

All these great and good things circle round the one Seed, which is Christ. The rest of the seed have all become such through Him. They were constitutionally the seed of the serpent. In this respect the Jews were no better than the Gentiles. Paul declared that he had proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they were all under sin. They were all under sin because all had become the property of sin. Viewing them in this enslaved condition, Paul applied the Scripture which saith, "There is none righteous, no, not one."

The Seed in chief purchased the rest with His own blood. He gave His life a ransom. None of them could by any means at their command redeem his brother. The rich could not buy, neither could the poor beg. They could not be redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold. The great and precious price was not to be found in all earthly riches. It must be sent from God, therefore God sent His only begotten Son to the rescue. None of the good and righteous men of old had any power. They all needed help themselves, being "without strength." The arm of the Lord was seen, mighty to save in Jesus Christ, The Righteous. He is the Root on which all the seed is borne in the spiritual sense; and being of royal Israelitish offspring also, He has all the natural claims to sovereign power. Every setting sun marks the approval of this Great Sower, who will fill the earth with the "seed of God;" this will be the great day of Jezreel.

### **BETH-EL.**

The city which bore this name, the meaning of which is The House of God, has a kind of double history, presenting a general resemblance to the history of that other House of God composed of living stones.

The town stood a little to the north of Jerusalem, and between it and Ai - another spot of great interest - lay Mount Ephraim. It was to this mountain that Abram came and builded an altar to the Lord, after he left Haran, traversing Sichem and the plain of Moreh. On his return journey from the south he stayed here

a short time and made an arrangement with his nephew, Lot, as to what portion of the country each should dwell in.

In this matter Abram showed a true generosity, giving his younger relative the first choice. By this time Abram had become very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold. He is a rare example of a rich and righteous man. His quickly acquired wealth does not appear to have at all cooled his religious ardour. It is recorded that on this second visit "he there called on the name of the Lord." Here Jacob saw the vision of the ladder connecting earth with heaven. Messengers were ascending and descending in the execution of their office as watchers over the affairs of men, for the final good of the house of God. The erection of the pillar, and the anointing of it with oil, might, to the troubled mind of the patriarch, have a mystic significance, foreshadowing the Chief Corner Stone, the Anointed One. Under temporal trial it is that the heart seeks shelter and repose in a strongly guarded future. The human bark cuts her moorings and flies for some pacific isle, resting on the bosom of an ever glassy sea.

When the prophet Samuel judged Israel, he included Bethel in his yearly circuit. The last day that the prophet Elijah sojourned on earth he called at Bethel, and there prayed Elisha not to follow him further. It was there also that the children were torn by bears for mocking Elisha on his return from beyond Jordan, after his master had been carried off in the chariot of fire. In that memorable revolt which rent the house of God, it was at Bethel that the usurper placed one of the golden calves, appointed a feast, ordained priests, and built an altar to hinder the people from returning to Jerusalem. Before this altar stood a man of God out of Judah, and uttered an awful prediction, which was confirmed by the altar being rent and the arm of Jeroboam being dried up while in the act of putting it forth against the prophet. These denunciations were literally fulfilled three hundred and fifty years afterwards by Josiah, who tore open the graves of the idolatrous priests, took out their bones, and burned them on the altar. And he slew all the priests of the high places that were there upon the altar, and men's bones upon them. The two very ancient prophets Hosea and Amos foretold the destruction of Beth-el and its idolatrous worship.

When Paul and Peter speak of the obedient believers of the gospel, they sometimes employ the figure of the house of God, borrowed no doubt from the literal house in Jerusalem. In his epistle to the Hebrews, Paul refers to Moses and his house, to shew in a more striking manner the exaltedness of Christ. Moses was a servant, but Christ was a Son; Moses ruled in the house of another; Christ in his own house; Moses builded his house according to a given pattern; Christ was the creator of His own house. The difference is very great.

The Son of God was the true Lord and owner of the house which He builded. Jesus was quite as faithful, nay, more faithful than Moses; but His conduct towards God was that of a son to his father. Moses gave his commandments, not in his own name, but in the name of the Lord. Jesus spoke as one that had supreme authority; issued precepts in His own name, and plainly declared Himself to be the Lord and Master of His disciples.

In consequence of this, Christ was counted worthy of more glory than Moses. His sovereign dignity is strongly sustained by Paul in the first and second of Hebrews. He is not only superior to all men, but to all angels. In rank every angel stands far below Him. Yea, they are commanded to do Him homage. He was superior to angels in dignity, and higher than all men in purity; separate was He and undefiled.

He is the foundation of His own house, and other foundation can no man lay than that is laid. Neither Jew nor Greek can rest thereon; none can enter into the composition of this building, and remain unclean. All who touch it are cleansed and sanctified thereby. The truth makes clean, and Jesus is the truth. All the children of Christ have been given to Him by His Father. They are gifts to the altar, so to speak. The altar is greater than the gift; and every gift is sanctified by the altar to which it is brought.

As the spotless victims under the law were for the reconciliation of the house, so Christ hath, by His own blood, made full reconciliation for His own house. This He accomplishes for the constituents of the house while they were sinners; enemies of God; by which God commended His love towards them. There is, therefore, the greatest assurance that they will be saved by His life. This was God's work, God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself; and the apostles, as Christ's ambassadors, prayed men and besought them, saying: Be ye reconciled to God, for He hath made Him, that is, Christ, who was without sin, a sin-offering for us, that we might be the righteousness of God in Him.

God, according to His gracious promise, opened a fountain to the house of David, for sin and for all uncleanness. The fountain was soon made accessible to Greek as well as Jew. It is open still, and will be till the end of the Messianic age, when this world will be purged from sin. Like the Syrian of old, we are implored by the humble messengers of Jehovah to wash and be clean;

Faith in these things, which works by love, purifies the heart. This is the great object of all: be ye holy, even as I am holy. It is a most salutary reflection that, like as God dwelt in Christ, He desires also to dwell in us. Think of the goodness, the purity, the love, the long-suffering of God. Are we so governing

and purifying ourselves as to become a fit dwelling-place for this marvellous perfection and power? Or, are we daily defiling and polluting His temple, cleansed and reconciled by the blood of His spotless and only Son? Are malice and envy still tenants of the house? Do wrath and clamour yet echo within its walls? Do these barbarous sounds still shock the strangers' ear, where all should be a holy calm, or rapturous music from the heavenly lyre?

### THE FLESH.

The frequent occurrence of this phrase, and its connexion in several of the most striking passages of Paul's letters, make it well worthy of our consideration. Of late much has been said of "the flesh," and indeed, it has been singularly common in the religious conversation and writings of our body. In their prayers, Paul's words, "rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh," have often been heard. If these prayers were always made "with the understanding," it may be doubted whether the saying just cited would have found place.

As the epistles were addressed to Jews as well as Gentiles, there are portions which speak sometimes to the one, sometimes to the other, and sometimes to both. To profit by the reading, it is therefore necessary to take due notice of these distinctions. It will be immediately perceived from the context of the words taken from the third verse of the third chapter of Philippians, that Paul made allusion to the Law of Moses: the expression "the flesh" is therefore at times equivalent to "the law." It is still more comprehensive, for it includes circumcision; and thus it may be said to cover the whole legal existence of the Jew from Abram to Christ. To make this plain we will transcribe the passage:

"For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh: Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more."

"Any other man" is to be taken in a limited sense. The rest of the passage shows that Paul meant any other Jew at Philippi; not any other man, Jew or Gentile, in the whole world.

"Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee." Here the Apostle specifies the advantages he could, if he thought proper, boast of in "the flesh," that is, as a Jew of high standing; a member of a noble title - for Benjamin was classed with Judah - a pure Hebrew by father and mother, not like many who were born of Grecian women - and of the highest sect among the Jews. And more still the Apostle declared himself to be, "touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless." In this last particular Paul was like Zacharias and his wife Elizabeth. "They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, blameless."

"The flesh," then, appears to be an elliptical, or shortened, form of words, signifying the Law of Moses and circumcision. The same law is elsewhere styled a carnal ordinance, that is, an ordinance pertaining to the flesh, briefly named "the flesh." This abridged and laconic style is not uncommon in the Sacred Writings, and is very convenient to the writer; though to foreign readers, or to readers of a much later age, it is not without difficulty, and demands the use of the thinking and enquiring faculties in order to a good understanding of the subject matter of the discourse.

In other parts of Paul's epistles he uses the expression, "the flesh," in quite a different sense, which shows the need there is for determining the import of the same words by the connection in which they stand.

"They that are in the flesh cannot please God." From a misapprehension of this text some have concluded that to please God it is necessary to die - to put off the flesh in a literal sense; that flesh is essentially a wicked thing. However this may be, the text in question does not teach such a doctrine. Just before Paul explains what he means by "they that are in the flesh." "The carnal mind," he says, "is enmity against God." And in the verse but one preceding he shows clearly what he intends by "the carnal mind." They that are of a carnal mind "do mind the things of the flesh;" that is to say, they gratify their animal passions in all the ways at their command. In this there is such a wide field, and some vices seem so near akin to virtues, that it is incumbent to be always watchful.

The curious extremes of the human mind have often made excessive devotion and excessive carnality meet in the same individual; hence it has been not seldom remarked that one man was composed of several different characters. Piety and inconsistency, spiritual and carnal extravagance, often walk together, and the brighter the light the darker the shade.

These defects did not escape the observant eye of Paul. His counsel in the matter was, "Let your moderation be known unto all men. Every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things. Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown; but we an incorruptible." Such as do not give heed to this

wise counsel are said to be “in the flesh;” while to them who follow it Paul would say, “Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit.”

Think in how many ways this may be true; how it may apply to all, the rich and poor; but especially to the rich, who have the means, and consequently the temptation, to keep “in the flesh,” and therefore for whom it is no easy thing to “walk in the Spirit.” A rich man living with moderation and frugality that he may have all the more wherewith to do good unto all men, but especially to the household of faith, is a truly noble and admirable sight.

But in view of the frailty of human nature, and the temptation of riches, the Christian is almost constrained to desire only those things that are sufficient for his daily wants. It is easier to be content with little than with much. Contentment is a chief element of spiritual life, but godliness with contentment is great gain.

“The carnal mind,” which more literally translated would read “the thought of the flesh,” Paul says, “is death.” That is, it leads to death. But this saying must not be strained, or else it will make the Apostle teach what he did not mean. The foregoing remarks have probably shown that one of the senses in which Paul employed the words, “the flesh,” indicates animal or worldly-mindedness. It is this which he says is death. An extreme view of the passage would make the Apostle teach that flesh cannot conceive a single idea but what is displeasing to God. This interpretation will not stand.

God who created the brain, has made it capable of evolving thought, both good and evil. There is no change in the material of this organ or engine of thought, because the owner of it declares himself a convert to the Christian faith. It is qualified for a variety of work, and according to circumstances, one part may be very active, while another is almost dormant. This is produced by what phrenologists call “cultivating “ and “restraining,” the best lessons for which are found in the Scriptures. The Book of Proverbs and the New Testament Epistles abound with advice to suit every variety of humanity; but if you will have it all in one word, take the great saying of Christ: Do unto others as you would they should do unto you.

“For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing.” If Paul here referred to his material body and its members, there would seem no need to throw in the words “that is, in my flesh,” after the word “me.” The “me” can point to no one but himself, whether in his Christian character, or in an assumed position. “That is, in my flesh,” looks much like a comment on the word “me,” as though he were using it just there in a particular way. The seventh and eighth chapters seem to well support this sense. In the first the apostle takes the part of a carnal-minded Jew, who has a certain knowledge of the law, but who finds himself in a wretched condition because he cannot fulfil the desires of the flesh, and keep the commandments at the same time.

Then in the eighth chapter Paul describes a man who is “delivered,” - a man to whom there is no more condemnation, because he is “not in the flesh,” or following the fleshly passions, but in Christ, walking after the commandments of the Spirit. The phrase “my flesh” in this place, therefore, appears to be a shortened form, similar to the phrase “the flesh,” before spoken of.

\* “Hardly anyone, I think, reading the whole passage continuously, without any regard to the arbitrary break at the close of the 7th chapter, would be in danger of supposing that the Apostle Paul, though speaking in the first person, is describing his own natural character, in his regenerate sanctified state, when he describes a man “sold under sin;” “brought into subjection to the law of sin;” “doing the evil that he would not;” “not doing the good that he would;” and living a life of wretched contradiction to his own judgment.”[To he continued.]

[See Whately’s Extract, *Christadelphian Lamp*, November, 1878, p. 19.

---

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

64, Belgrave Road, Birmingham, 16th April, 1874.

Mr. Edward Turney. - As the period of your absence from England is now drawing to a close, I think it well to inform you that I am ready to debate with you, either at Birmingham or Nottingham, the question you have raised among the friends of the truth. I will affirm during four nights:

“That Christ, in the days of his flesh, was, and His mission required Him to be, equally affected with ourselves by the sentence of death passed upon Adam.”

Or, I will take the negatives of any proposition you may affirm, provided it is worded in a way to admit of my doing so. I propose that the Socratic method of discussion be adopted during two of the nights, as this form admits of each side putting the other to the test more effectually than discussion by speeches exclusively. If you have any confidence in the position you take, you will not object to this. If you object, I must waive my proposal, and be content with speech discussion during the four nights.

Let me hear at once that I may arrange. You know the hand-writing, but I add my name. Striving at all times to be, faithfully, ROBERT ROBERTS.

P.S. - You will, of course, limit the auditory to professors of the truth.

-----  
The foregoing came to hand too late to receive attention in our May issue, and was privately acknowledged.

It has been well known for several months, from what has been printed, that the double challenge we gave the writer of this letter was not accepted by him, nor any of his friends. The reason he gave for not accepting it was that, when we returned, "it would be too late: the mischief would then be done." These are his own words. Could any refusal be plainer than this?

The same week, August 29, 1873, he delivered a lecture entitled, "The Slain Lamb." Upon the handbill for this lecture he declares it "was instrumental, in the hand of God, in vanquishing the new heresy in the Birmingham ecclesia." Since then nearly 70 persons have adopted the so-called heresy, most of whom withdrew from the "ecclesia," and we were informed that some others are by no means satisfied.

In delivering this lecture Bro. Roberts completely broke down in a fit of passion or excitement. When it was over Bro. J. J. Andrew ran off to Liverpool, and confessed "it was a failure," he had been "disappointed" with it; he also pronounced the same thing when printed to be "unsatisfactory" though it had been considerably improved, and so much altered as to be scarcely recognisable by many who heard it.

In the Christadelphian Lamp this lecture was "dissected," paragraph by paragraph. We also possessed a verbatim report of it. The gross misapplication of scripture, particularly the Psalms, was found to be on so large a scale as to be unaccountable, except by equally gross negligence, or something worse.

It is scarcely necessary to refer to the several opportunities of discussion, private and public, Bro. Roberts had been offered before the lecture on the Sacrifice of Christ; suffice it to say that he hampered all those with such conditions that no sensible man would agree to. The excuse he offered for refusing a public debate by speeches was that "it would be subjecting himself to an irritating situation."

Not long since he was pressed by the Leicester brethren to go there and deliver a lecture to them explaining his views. He declined, and sent a copy of his lecture on The Slain Lamb, here subjoined: -

Athenaeum Rooms, Temple Bow, Birmingham, 26th January, 1874.

To Bro. Weale, and those for whom he writes, - I have received your invitation to "give a public lecture on the view held and contended for by me in relation to the Christ as contradistinguished from the views held by you."

"If your object be to ascertain my view, this object can be attained in a much simpler way than the way proposed, viz., by reading the enclosed lecture, which is precisely of the character of the one requested. Let one of you read this to the rest assembled, and it will be me "giving a lecture on the view held and contended for by me." If your object be to identify me with your view in Leicester, or to revive a controversy which had well be dead, you cannot expect me to comply with your request. I will but add that, notwithstanding your insinuation to the contrary, I "continue to see the matter in the light I first contended for," and have contended for ever since I understood the truth: that, therefore, I recognise no "reparation" as due except from those who have caused division by the introduction of heresy: and furthermore, that in the service of the truth I cannot be induced to accept "neutral ground." Praying for your restoration to the way of truth,

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT ROBERTS.

In The Christadelphian for April, page 181, under the heading Dr. Thomas and the Renunciationists, Bro. Roberts told the brethren at Galashiels that "it is not worthwhile to take notice of what emanates from them ("the Renunciationists") for many obvious reasons."

He has repeatedly advised his brethren not to read The Christadelphian Lamp, because it is written with so much "subtlety" that they are very likely to be deceived by it. He has also assured them that he

does not read it himself. If this be really so, it is not easy to see how he is acquainted with its “subtlety,” and how quotations from it find their way into his periodical. That periodical indicates that the editor is very well acquainted with the contents of the Lamp. But, after all, we are forgetting that he “knows all we can say before we speak,” as he gravely informed us before we began our lecture on the Sacrifice of Christ!

Since Bro. Roberts “vanquished the new heresy under God” and “cleared the healthy channel of the Christadelphian,” the said heresy has spread far and wide, and the circulation of The Christadelphian Lamp has exceeded the expectations of all its friends who knew the difficulties lying in its course, while the Christadelphian still bristles with anger in every issue, yet never so far forgetting itself as to spell the word lamp in capital letters. The horror it has of this orthography is ominous indeed.

When the lecture on the Sacrifice of Christ was delivered, Bro. R. had a masked battery of “eighty-five questions,” which, owing to the tactics of the enemy, he could not discharge at the desired moment. It was afterwards “let off,” and found to be crammed with nothing but blank cartridge. Fifty-nine of the celebrated eighty-five were found to rest entirely on the assumption of the point in dispute, and the rest were answered.

From the first we have read all Bro. Roberts has advanced on the question, but find no fact or argument sufficient in our judgment to support his position; while the manner in which he misrepresents the opposite side has long been remarked by hundreds who were favourable to his case.

Bro R. tells us he has no more to say, and we are of opinion that during the past seven or eight months he has put forth his best efforts. What, then, after all this, does he expect to gain for the cause of truth by a personal encounter? Does he reckon upon his flow of caustic, his expertness in “the Socratic method;” or his power of abuse at high pressure? at which pressure he occasionally breaks down with ignominy before the public, and even danger to his own life when no opponent is before him.

The considerations now presented might well justify us in refusing Bro. Roberts and certain of his well-behaved friends the luxury of creating a similar disgraceful uproar to that which they made at our lecture on the Sacrifice of Christ; there is also this other consideration of proper self-respect, after the unmeasured abuse, including the insinuation of “forgery,”\* of which we have been the subject from him and his friends during the past half-year.

We might fall back upon medical advice, to which he himself has properly resorted, and the increased demands upon our time; but of these things we will say nothing.

In conclusion, as an evidence that we are not incited by a spirit of ambition for preeminence, we are ready, whenever Bro. R. shall cease to teach that the Christ was a sinner by birth, like all other men, we are ready, with the consent of our friends, to discontinue the Lamp, and to assist him in any way in our power, if desired.

After all this, we make one proposal - final and unalterable. The Thirty-two Questions (corrected copy) being the original cause of hostilities, and having been affirmed by Bro. Roberts to be false and unscriptural, we are willing to hear him attack them for two hours one night, on condition that we are allowed two hours for reply on the night but one after. The attack and defence to be in the Temperance Hall, Birmingham. That if any personalities be introduced by Bro. R. we shall have the option of refusing to reply. That there shall be no expression of feeling on the part of the audience. That 1000 copies of the discussion shall be published under one cover for general circulation, the cost to be borne equally by each side. That none but the spoken matter shall be published, and none omitted. The reporters only to correct the proofs. That no formal questions be put for reply unless written copies of the same be furnished to us the first night and that such formal questions shall not exceed four.

\* See Christadelphian cover, February Number.

It was only after much pressure that we consented to become editor and it would seem unreasonable that so large a circle of friends as the Lamp represents should have no organ for the expression of their views. As a matter of duty, therefore, we think it right to do what we can in their service, especially as the more stable and intelligent part of the body are equally ready to cooperate in the work, and to bear the present heavy drain upon their purse, for the sole purpose of being useful to their brethren, and to promote the service of God “with the spirit and with the understanding also.”

When they shall have no further need for our services, we will make our bow and retire, knowing where to find abundance of pleasure and advantage, which popularity can neither give nor take away.

EDITOR.

-----

113, Beekman Street, New York,  
April 13th, 1874.

Mr. Edward Turney. - Dear Brother, - My attention was directed to you and your work of late in the Christadelphian, up to January, 1874; but having learned from my friend and teacher, Dr. Thomas, to prove all things, and to hold fast the good, I have examined your lecture on the "Sacrifice of Christ," in the light of the Scriptures, with Bro. Roberts reply, and Elpis Israel; the conclusion that I have come to is this, to take my stand on the subject of your lecture, believing it to be in harmony with the Scriptures; and if the honest expression of this opinion must lead my brethren to regard me as having departed from the faith so be it; but I trust that my kindness and affection for them, no less now than formerly, they may, through the grace of God, be willing to examine for themselves. During my connection with the brethren Dr. Thomas was my friend, and now that he sleeps near to where I write, I still love his memory. On one occasion during his lifetime two of my brethren took exception to the Dr's teaching. I advised them, if they thought he was wrong, to overthrow him by argument. I then went to the Dr. and stated to him what I had done, and in the nobility of manhood he said I had done right, for he remarked, Brother Ennis, I want the truth. The Dr. never pretended to be infallible. I thank God that in His good providence I heard him speak for years on "the deep things of God;" but that is no reason why I should now close my eyes and ears and say, I will stick to the Dr. "for better or for worse;" no, by the grace of God, I will stick to men only for good. Hoping that the grace of God may rest on you, and that you will continue to declare the whole counsel of God, I remain, your Brother, in the hope,

WILLIAM ENNIS.

We publish this letter with pleasure. The writer of it was regarded by the late Dr. Thomas as a man of generally good judgment, of independence of thought, and of pleasant companionship. The respectful manner in which he speaks of the Doctor may set others a good example, with whom a different view upon a point of doctrine appears to give rise to asperity of feeling and expression.

Let those who have been hindered from reading the Lecture on the Sacrifice of Christ, by persuasion or by prejudice, follow the excellent example here presented; and also mark the good spirit towards those who differ in judgment, while holding firmly, and confessing frankly what is believed to be according to the word of God.

No doubt our fraternal correspondent will miss no opportunity of bringing before his American brethren a matter which "after examination had," he finds to be of such moment. Our earnest prayers and best wishes attend his and their efforts to lay hold of the truth.

-----  
**TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CHRISTADELPHIAN LAMP"**

616, Wells Street, Milwaukie, April 7th, 1874.

My Dear Friend, - I am happy in the reception of a package of "Christadelphian Lamps." They were an unexpected refreshment to me, for which we are truly thankful, in our lone attitude in the testimony for the pure, holy, and uncondemned Son of God. We did not expect, when we wrote to you concerning your noble move and struggle on behalf of the "Lamb of God," that you would send us your monthly, without knowing, so far as we are concerned, where the needful for the printer was to come from. Nevertheless, we will furnish our little quota, to keep that useful member of society in a good frame of mind; for his type will not come into place without the needful.

When we read your first number of the "Christadelphian Lamp," we could not see clearly the end toward which you were driving, in your argument for an uncondemned Christ. We were afraid that the foundation of your building could not bear the conclusions arrived at, in opposition to the wisdom emanating from the advocates of a condemned Anointed. But as we read carefully the succeeding numbers your position, both in foundation and superstructure began to be perceived by us. We found to the joy of our heart that the whole of your argument hinged upon the glorious truth, The Son of Man is the "CHRIST, the SON of the living God," THE HOLY ONE OF GOD; the heavenly, not the earthly Adam. This is the glory and the holy oil of your Lamp. This great truth is a rock, a foundation broad and large; it can bear all the conclusions of holiness, righteousness, purity, and truth. Therefore, with all my heart, I bid you "God speed" in your labour for the spotless "Lamb of God." I love to be a partaker in your sin of heresy.

Yet, while admitting all this, I would like to say a word or two; not by way of fault-finding, but just as a let out of my mind: and first, your kind “Correspondents” seem to enjoy their liberty too much. The notes of their trumpets are not as distinctive as Paul admonishes. I know all this will come out all right by and by. The situation is new, and there is somewhat of an excitement attending it, which will wear off by reason of use, and the discerning of good and evil.

Again, in the second place, your correspondents are too apt to say too much, and by that means spoil their premises. Gold is put up in small bulk. The trouble with the “opposition” is too much talk. They hardly know from one new moon to the other what they have said concerning the Christ. The demand of our day is not quantity, but quality; wheat, not chaff.

Again, although we do accept the situation of the truth in England with joy of heart, there is a matter upon which we wish to state our mind with all freedom, even though it be viewed as an opinion of ours. It is this; that the truth as comprehended and advocated in your midst, is caused to occupy a premature position before the public mind. The brow and front of your testimony is the spotless character of the “Lamb of God.” Now, there are two points passed over by you in gaining this position, which the public mind ought to be well informed upon; at least that public mind which loves to know the truth of God. First, Who is the Christ? How is He the Mediator, seeing a Mediator is not of one? “But God is one.” This is a physical issue. It is not concerning the office, but the officer; who is he? And secondly, have the advocates of the sinless and uncondemned Christ, as manifested in England, a right to be vessels to carry the holy character of the Son of God? The mere change of view concerning Jesus of Nazareth will not establish a right to Him, who is the beloved of the Father. This brings up an ugly look upon the situation. Yet, nevertheless, the truth must be known. An individual baptized unto a Christ that is proven to be false, can never put on the true by merely changing his mind from a son of Adam to a Son of God. It is because of these considerations we conclude the position to be premature, as occupied by you; even though that position is good and lovely.

Having said this much, we will now put the following questions to all whom it may concern: - “Unto what, then, were ye baptized?” Was it unto the “Name” of the “Only-begotten of the Father?” the Son of God, “full of grace and truth;” or was it unto the name of a Christ, the son of Adam only, full of sin and under condemnation? If unto the name of the only-begotten Son of the Father, believing with all the heart the testimony of God concerning His well-beloved Son, then you are in the one baptism. But if not, your immersion has nothing to do with the Christ Paul preached, for the Christ he preached was the “Son of God.”

Again “Be it according to your faith.” Was your faith at your immersion in the son of Adam only, or the Son of the living God? That Jesus of Nazareth was the only-begotten of the Father, not the only-created like Adam. An only-created born of God is like an eternal Son of God, or the imaginary ghost, the immortal soul.

Again, “Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.” Whom did you obey, when you were immersed in water for the remission of your sins? Was it the sinful and condemned son of Adam only; the seed of Abraham only, of one nature, and that human, full of sin and under the curse of the law; the son of David’s daughter only, created by the power of the Holy Spirit. And yet claimed not to be a mere man, although he could be nothing else; being created from the substance of the woman only, as Adam was created from the substance earth only. Adam was a mere man, why not the son of Adam also? Unto what, then, were ye baptized?”

Again, “He that honoureth the Son, honoureth the Father.” Is it an honour to the Son of God, who is the truth; a humble and sincere intention to be united to the true one but in reality we come to find out we were united to that which can be clearly proven to be false. And will it be an honour to the truth to continue in that intention, after we have found out our ignorance of the true one, without obeying from the heart the Son of God by baptism unto His death? Or will it be an honourable action on our part, if we know him that is true, to transfer our immersion into the doubtful, or unto the false, on to the only begotten Son of God and call it the one baptism? This question is not to be put off by the doctrine of imputation. The Son of the living God is honoured by our obeying the truth from the heart. The righteousness of God is imputed to us when we honour the Father by honouring the Son. And this is his work, to do the will of Him who sent His Son, Jesus the Anointed.

Again, Christ, the condemned son of Adam, is not the Christ the “Holy One,” and the “Just One,” “The Son of God.” Neither is the Christ, the constitutional sinner, the Christ “who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.” Neither is Christ a created son like Adam, the Christ who is the only-begotten Son of God. Neither is the Christ that is A Son of God, the Christ that is THIS Son of God. Neither is the Christ that was created by the power of the Holy Spirit, the Christ that was conceived of Holy Spirit. Neither was the Christ that was holy by the law of Moses, like the firstlings of Israel’s flocks, the Christ

that was holy because of Holy Spirit, and the power of the Highest. Neither can an individual be holy as He is holy, unless they put on the holy one of God, as Saul of Tarsus did eighteen hundred years ago. Then, they will have the full right to proclaim that Jesus of Nazareth is the “Christ, the Son of the living God.” Their province is not so much to testify how He is the Son, as it is to make known the glorious fact that He is indeed the “Son of the Father in truth and love.”

Who, then, is this Son of the Highest? this Son of the living God? He is the Jehovah. “The eternal life that was with the Father, and was manifested.” For fellowship with the Father, with the Son, and with the Apostles of the Lord Jesus the Christ. So that the Christ question is the eternal life question; and therefore the question of all questions, having the most cumulative importance in our day. To God be all the glory that it is so, for thereby the man of God will be brought out in all the obedience of Gideon’s faithful army, who could lap the water like a dog, and throw terror into the hosts of the Midianites.

In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. 1 John iv. 9. Did God send Adam into the world? Is he not of the earth, earthy? Whereas Jesus is the Lord from heaven. This is not an issue for philosophers or ecclesiastical politicians, but for faithful men and women, who love the Lord Jesus Christ for His glorious work toward them; and above all for his own inherent worth, as the salvation of Jehovah, Elohim of Israel.

HUGH SHARP.

---

## QUESTIONS BY BRO. JAMES GRANT, OF GRANTOWN.

THE following questions were coupled with an interesting letter, which, however, we are not authorised to publish: -

1. - What does it require to constitute personal relationship to the Adamic sentence of death or condemnation - what is the least possible basis of its application?

It requires one to be begotten by a descendant of Adam, or by Adam himself. “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death hath passed upon all men in whom (margin, which is correct) all have sinned. (Rom. v. 12.) “In Adam all die.” (1Cor. xv. 22.)

2. - What do you understand by life, that is, how much or how little does it apply to as regards flesh, that we may thus see whether what was the result of the Spirit’s operation upon the womb of Mary was solely the life of the Son, or whether there was what could be called life in the basis flesh with which the Spirit constituted the germ of the Son developed in the ordinary way?

Webster’s large dictionary gives fourteen definitions of the word life. We transcribe the first: “That state of an animal or plant in which its organs are capable of performing their functions; animate existence; vitality; also, the time during which this state continues, either in general, or in an individual instance; as the life of a tree, or a horse.”

Without human or divine intervention Mary could have had no off-spring. “How shall this be, seeing I know not a man.” (Luke i. 34.)

3. - If the former be the case, that is, life only subsequent to the Spirit’s interference, then I suppose you would call it free in view of the reasonable conclusion that the condemnation to die would be inapplicable to what Christ inherited from Adam, viz., dead flesh? Without independent existence and moral consciousness there is no responsibility. The vitality of flesh as seen in a child in the womb, or in a man whose head is severed from his body by the stroke of a sword, does not make the possessor an accountable being.

4. - But if the latter be the case, that is, life in some sense or some degree in the basis substance with which the Spirit interfered for the development of a Son, who would at a certain period evolve independent life as other human beings do, then could you call Christ’s life free if the flesh He inherited from Adam was under a sentence of death, which was consistently applicable if it was not dead flesh?

No condemnation rested on the flesh because it was flesh, else it were condemned as soon as made; but because it sinned it was condemned. Had Christ been begotten of “the will of the flesh,” the condemnation of Adam would have rested on Him, and constituted Him “by nature a child of wrath, even as others.” But being made “in the likeness of sin’s flesh,” begotten by a Father with whom is no sin, is not the conclusion correct that He (Christ) was free from that condemnation?

5. - Was there anything condemned in Christ on account of His own nature alone?

Christ's nature was human; it was not angelic, else death could not affect it. Adam's nature was quite as human before he sinned as after, therefore there is no condemnation either upon Adam or Christ on account of nature alone,

**6.** - How was the devil destroyed through His (Christ's) death?

The devil and sin are used by Paul as synonymous terms. The prophet declares that on Christ God hath laid the iniquity of as all. After this Christ, by His voluntary sacrificial death, removed "the iniquity" for ever; but it remained for man to do his part; so Paul says, "We beseech you therefore, be ye reconciled to God." The destruction of the devil, in the fullest extent of its meaning, probably signifies the complete removal of sin from the earth.

We have, as requested by Bro. Grant, made our answers as short as possible.

EDITOR.

---

## QUESTIONS BY BRO. THOMAS WILLIAMS,

**RIVERSIDE, WASHINGTON Co., IOWA.**

**1.** - I suppose it is right to say that Deity does not experiment; therefore all things performed by Him are in accordance with His plan, working out His purposes? (Eph. iii. 11.)

Quite right. The Scripture saith that Jehovah sees all things, the end from the beginning; no experiment, therefore, is needed to discover results to His mind.

**2.** - Was Jesus first in the plan? If He was, is it not wrong to presume that if Adam had not eaten of the tree of "knowledge of good and evil, and if he had eaten of the tree of life he would have been made immortal?

If Jesus were not "in the plan" it could not be said that Jehovah knows all things, the end from the beginning; nevertheless there is nothing wrong in reasoning upon the consequences arising out of an opposite course of action to that taken by His subjects. Reason requires that every possible view be considered, and when reasoning is calmly conducted it helps greatly to strengthen and enlarge the mind.

**3.** - Jesus said, "I am the way." Would this have been true if uttered before the fall of Adam; if it would, then is it right to talk of the possibility of Adam becoming immortal by eating of the tree of life?

The provision in Christ before known to the Father did not compel Adam to commit sin; it is therefore perfectly "right to talk of the possibility of Adam becoming immortal by eating of the tree of life." That possibility is contemplated in the saying, "And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever. (Gen. iii. 22.)

**4.** - Was the tree of life intended for anything except to point to Christ?

It is nowhere positively stated that the tree of life in Eden did point to Christ; but the inference that it did seems a reasonable one.

**5.** - If mortality is "life manifested through a corruptible body," is it not as true to say that Adam was created mortal as that he was created corruptible?

Mortal means "destined to die."\* Adam was not "destined to die" until he had sinned; therefore it is not strictly correct to say "he was created mortal." But he was created corruptible, which means "capable of death." In a general and loose way the two words are interchangeable.

**6.-** If so, then is it not wrong to talk of Adam ever having a "free life;" and therefore, even if Jesus had been as Adam before sin, He would not have had a "free life"

"If so;" but it is not so, as the proper definition of the word mortal shews; therefore it appears that the life of Adam before he transgressed was "free;" that is to say, free from sentence of death.

**7.** - Was not Adam bodily and practically the way into the grasp of death? if so, must not Jesus be regarded as bodily and practically "the way" out?

After Adam had sinned he was the way to death. In him all died. Christ "in whom was no sin," who was "undefiled and separate from sinners," is "the way out."

EDITOR.

\* See first definition in Webster's large Dictionary.

# **THE FIRST AND SECOND ADAMS.**

## **BY BRO. JOHN BUTLER, OF BIRMINGHAM.**

(Continued from May, page 10)

WE must have, if any good is to be effected in us, the law of God as a lamp unto our feet, and a light unto our path. Without it we are sure to go astray, and its absence has been the cause universally of departure from uprightness or existence in the opposite. There is no depth of moral degradation to which man can descend which cannot be satisfactorily and fully accounted for by the unilluminated operations of the natural mind. Take away the guiding light of God's will as the true motive power of man's actions, and you remove the pole star, and the mariner is then sure to be tossed on the sea of uncertainty and cast on the rocks of perdition. Truly, men perish for lack of knowledge. That lack is produced in three ways. We may lack it through no fault of our own; we may lack it through neglecting wilfully the means of acquiring it; or, having acquired it, we may lose it from inattention, and forgetfulness. Dr. Thomas rightly remarked that salvation is in a great measure a matter of memory. The experience of each of us will, I have no doubt, tend to verify this statement. The Apostle Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, said they would be saved by the gospel he had preached unto them if they kept in memory the things he had told them, and what was true of them is equally applicable to us. Our memories are so treacherous that unless we take means continually to refresh them we lose that grasp of the truth which is necessary to sustain us in our intercourse with the world. When the words of scripture fade from our minds, our comprehension of duty fades with them, and we approach rapidly that condition of ignorance which alienates from the life of God. The moment we begin to forget, the flesh begins to assume the mastery, that which was good in its place begins to intrude, and God recedes into the back-ground. This is universally true. Returning to Adam, then, we see that there was in the desires and propensities implanted within him by the very nature of his constitution, quite sufficient, combined with forgetfulness or neglect of God's commands, to explain the fall and all subsequent wickedness, without accepting the theory of a fixed principle of sin instilled in him by the serpent. The secret of the matter is this, that the flesh has no reasoning faculties; it obeys blindly its own instincts. It is like a railway train without a brake which runs on till its powers are exhausted. Reason comes and supplies the brake; but the brake of reason is in itself a defective one, and often fails to check; the word of God alone, coming to the assistance of reason, teaches us how to apply the brake effectually. The railway train, like the flesh, is a good thing, but it is of no practical use without the brake. "Walk in the Spirit," says Paul, "and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh," that is, put on the brake, "with the passions and lusts." "He that soweth to the flesh," that is, he that lets the flesh have its own way - applies no check, "shall of the flesh reap corruption." Now, if we labour under the misconception that our flesh is full of sin, completely brimming over, as it were, from a principle instilled subsequent to our first creation, and that that is constantly impelling us with irresistible force on the road to perdition, what do we raise up but a devil similar to that of orthodox theology? Such an idea will unnerve our arm, as I have previously remarked, and make us oft inclined to give up fighting in despair; whereas, if we only rightly realise that the desires within us are good and legitimate if kept within proper bounds, and that we acquire the power and the knowledge from the Word to keep them within those bounds, we gain additional strength from that realization, and continue the battle with renewed courage and increased hope.

Adam, in yielding to the desires of the flesh - yielding to desires which, however natural and innocent in themselves, ought to have been circumscribed by the commandment of God, and checked in the direction in which they tended was sowing to the flesh. He was, with human proneness, forgetting the command, "Do this and thou shalt die." Realising what he had done, we can say from his subsequent actions how ashamed he was of the transgression he had committed. But it was now too late: the fiat had gone forth, from Him who saith, "I am the Lord and change not." "In the day that thou eatest thereof, dying, thou shalt die," and the previous sentence now is confirmed: man is formally condemned to the dust from which the formative power of the Deity had previously evoked him. He is driven from Eden, debarred from the tree of life, compelled to get his living by the sweat of his brow; in a word, he begins to experience the evil, the bitterness of the withdrawal of God's special favour. He has passed from under God's protecting care into the shadow of sin and death, and, mark you, with him has passed all his race, the entire Adamic stock, enclosed in its federal, becomes subject to the condemnation. He is no longer entitled to the rights and privileges of a son of God, having forfeited all by the one act of transgression, together with life itself and the life of all who should proceed from him in the process of natural generation. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned." All have forfeited their lives, or rather had their lives forfeited for them, by this

one transgression, apart from any sin of the race subsequently, as is conclusively declared by Paul: "Sin is not imputed where there is no law; nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," that is, death claimed all - infants and adults - who lived between the Edenic and the Mosaic laws, though sin could not strictly be imputed to them, because they had no law to break. The Apostle, by this statement, to my mind, abundantly demonstrates that, by the sin of Adam, condemnation rests upon all his descendants apart from anything that they could do. This fact is not at all weakened by the other fact that, by the introduction of sin, a degeneracy of the race ensued, in consequence of which it became impossible for perfect righteousness to be developed in the condemned flesh. The two facts, to my mind, have an intimate relationship with each other - an interdependence, which is at the same time a justification of the Deity's primal condemnation of the whole stock, and a reason why He should pass over that stock and carry out the work of redemption on the basis of a new creation. What I mean by the statement that the interdependence of the condemnation and the degeneracy justified God's primal condemnation of the race, is this: that the Deity knew that the introduction of sin would by its own inherent tendency, render the development of perfect righteousness in the race impossible, and that, therefore, this fiat of universal condemnation would never operate unjustly upon a single individual of the race.

Why, then, you will perhaps say, was this general condemnation of all in one necessary, seeing that the same result would apparently have been produced without it? I answer, that it was necessary, for this reason: that whereby, by one stroke, as it were, in this act of condemnation He brought the whole race subject to His judgment (as He did more specifically in the case of the Mosaic law); for, if you will but think for a moment, it will be evident that but for this primal general condemnation the Deity would have had to treat with each individual as he arose, and would thus have cut out for Himself an endless work which was entirely unnecessary. He, therefore, condemns them en bloc, and as it were, proceeds unhampered to the preparation of a body whose mission it should be to do what they could not do, namely, develop perfect righteousness in their nature. But the question here arises, How was it, if there be not a fixed principle of sin in man, implanted there at the fall, that this universal dependency ensued, and that it became impossible for man subsequently to attain to righteousness? In answering this, I would remind you of what I have already said respecting the combination of man's faculties the moral, the intellectual, and the animal; and I would further offer a few remarks on what Paul says in Romans vii. 21, 22, 23 - "I find, then, a law that when I would do good evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." You see the Apostle here presents for our contemplation two laws which are by nature planted in our constitutions. One is the law of the mind, the other may be called scripturally the law of the flesh. These laws are both in us, mind you, by our very constitution. They were in Adam before he fell, as well as subsequently, and they both have their seat in the brain. The law of the mind, indeed, may be properly represented by the moral and intellectual faculties, of which I have before spoken; and the law of the flesh may be represented by the animal faculties. Here you have growing together, side by side, as botanists tell us is almost universally the case in the vegetable kingdom, the poison and the antidote. It is by the operation of the law of the mind that we perceive a thing to be right; it is by the operation of the law of the flesh that we exceed the right. For the human economy, to be conducted aright, the law of the mind must, in the continual warfare, prevail; but, alas, from the time of our first parents the conquest has been almost universally on the side of the flesh - on the side of the animal! And why? In the case of our first parents we may consider the laws spoken of by Paul to have been evenly balanced. The law of sin though operating - for this law is but the lust or desire I have previously drawn attention to - the law of sin operating had not yet impelled beyond the boundary of right. Temptation came; lust, or the law of sin in their members, impelled, and sin was the result. They fell. The law of the mind was overcome; it was quieted by the subtlety of the serpent: for you will recollect that Eve remarked to the serpent that that they had been commanded not to eat of the Tree of Knowledge lest they died. This was the law of the mind exerting itself; and what Eve ought to have done on this occasion was to have paused, for it is by pausing that the law of the mind is always strengthened; the auxiliary memory is then brought to its aid, and right action is more likely to be the result. But the sophistry of the serpent was again brought to bear; Eve forgot to think, that is, about it; she delivered the reins clean over to lust and sin and death were the results. The balance between the two laws was now destroyed. The law of sin had triumphed; the law of the mind was vanquished; and in moral as in physical conflicts to be vanquished is to be weakened for further conflict.

To be righteous became more difficult than before, from the fact of this defeat, for the descent to ruin is a continually increasing descent. This is probably what the Doctor meant by the fixation of the principle of sin in the flesh; if so, many of us may be nearer his opinion than we are aware of, though we

do not approve of the terms he employs: for though this tendency to sin existed in Adam whilst sinless, there is no denying that it became stronger in his descendants, and that it is yet all predominating in the "natural man." The fact, however, that the truth endows us with power to overcome our natural propensities and to guide them in the direction God approves, is an argument against the employment of the word "fixation." But in addition to this, the course which the Deity took tended to increase the tendency to sin. This may appear strange, and is strange if you only look at the proximate circumstances under our view; but looked at in the light of God's predetermined plan to bring ultimate good out of a period of evil, the strangeness disappears. The Deity, as we have already seen, turned Adam out of the garden in which food was provided for him without toil, into a state of things where it was difficult to procure. The animals, which before had acknowledged him as their superior and governor, many of them, at any rate, were set against him. The conditions of existence became much harder - all of which conditions strengthened the law of sin, or the propensities of his animal nature, and, by consequence, tended to weaken the law of his mind. Man became so absorbed in the struggle for existence that he neglected the culture of his higher faculties, and they, in consequence, by a law universally recognised in the physical world, and particularly so by phrenologists, were controlled by the lower faculties. I am at present far more ready with my right arm than with my left, but supposing I were to tie the more dexterous arm up, say for six months, and continue to use the other what would be the result? Obviously, the imprisoned limb would become, even when released, utterly useless for a time, and not only that, it would shrink in bulk and become in every respect deteriorated. Just so it is with the faculties or organs of the brain. Exercise some to the disuse of others and you bring one set into a condition of activity and power, in some cases surprising, while the neglected organs recede into a state of deadness sometimes approaching idiocy. This is not mere speculation, it is a fact proved by every-day observation and experience, and in this way I account for the universal dominancy of the law of the flesh, notwithstanding the existence of the law of the mind.

Take a man who has turned the whole bent of his mind to the exercise of one faculty, say acquisitiveness - the pursuit of wealth, to the neglect of every other object - and you are almost certain, absolutely certain, indeed, if a counteracting influence is not early brought to bear, to find that man's children of the same grasping, over-reaching, money-grubbing disposition as their parent. The mental bias of a man becomes stamped upon his offspring, and that is the reason you find such fiendish looking countenances in the dens of all large towns, where the impress of vice and crime has been deepened from generation to generation, till it has become stereotyped ineradicably, and the class are really become brute beasts, fit only to be taken and destroyed. This is the result of the law of sin unchecked by the law of the mind.

And in the condition last described were the Canaanites, when their iniquities were full - when the Israelites were commissioned to exterminate them. Such, to cut the matter short, is my explanation of the cause of man's degeneracy. Becoming absorbed in his daily occupations, he did not care to retain God in his knowledge; he neglected Him, and forgot Him, and so the Deity gave them over to a mind void of judgment. But degeneracy did not proceed with unvarying rapidity in every part of the race. There was still the law of the mind in them, and, though in every case this had become weakened, it was stronger in some cases than in others, and where it was exercised it retarded the downfall. Apart from God's interference, the downfall, though retarded, would in every case have been produced. He, however, did interfere, and, by planting the true hope in the breast of Abraham, He presented the rope to the drowning faculty, as it were, and so strengthened it for the conflict with the law of sin.

Abraham succeeded in so turning the scales as to be called, on account of the righteousness he thereby developed, the friend of God. This example, together with others, shows us that the law of sin is a thing that can in a great measure, by the assistance of the proper instrumentality, be conquered in its turn. It demonstrates the truth of my previous assertion, that it is in ignorance that the propensities rule, it is ignorance that alienates from the life of God, but that, guided by the light of God, he may keep those propensities within the sphere in which they can legitimately operate, in which they can be considered very good; for it is evident that, without something which we are required to check and restrain within ourselves, we could not fit ourselves to be trusted with any important mission: we should be mere insipid, useless creatures. But Abraham's righteousness, though eminent, was not perfect, and if it had been, being of the condemned stock, shut up in the dead-house reared by Adam's transgression, he could not have affected God's plan of saving the race.

The Deity intended from the very first that the raising up of a redeemer for the condemned stock should be the result of His own handiwork, and not the work of a mere accidental offshoot of the condemned race; so we find Him passing over Abel, Seth, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, Job, Daniel, Elijah, and Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, all of whom were pre-eminently righteous; and,

indeed, concerning some of whom we have the testimony that they were perfect and upright before God. He passes over the whole of these and fixes His purpose upon His only begotten Son, in accordance with His statement through the Apostle Paul (Rom. ix. 8), "They who are children of the flesh are not the children of God, but the children of promise, are counted for the seed. The whole plan of salvation resolves itself into a question of promise; for we are distinctly told that it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy (Rom. ix. 16) that the purpose of God according election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth.

(To be continued :)

---

## THE GLORIFICATION OF THE CHRIST.

That the scriptures might be fulfilled, it was necessary that the Lord Jesus the Christ should be perfected the third day, the day of His resurrection from the dead; and in this antitypical acceptance the types of the ceremonial law were accomplished, and the declaration of the Father in the Son verified in act, "destroy this temple, and I will raise it up in three days."

The Lord Jesus had done with all carnal association, as flesh and blood, when He finished the work the Father had given Him to do, and from thenceforth He knew no man after the flesh. Because of this separation in His mortal state, He forbid Mary immediately upon His resurrection to touch Him or do Him homage, but directed her to go to His disciples and say of Him, "I ascend to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God." This ascension to the Father was manifestly the change of His mortal into a spiritual nature, for the same day He Himself removes His prohibitory command, "touch me not," meeting the disciples going to Emmaus, and conversing with them, and making Himself known to them in the breaking of bread and exerting His spirit-power to disappear from their sight. Until He was accepted of the Father in that He feared, and the Deity gave Him glory by a spirit-birth in the fulness of the Godhead, there is no evidence that He possessed holy spirit at all; nay, the probability is to the contrary. The Spirit without measure was bestowed upon Him at His immersion in the Jordan, to effect a particular work for the Deity, and that being done, He awaited in His resurrected body of mortal flesh and blood, as it was before He was called as the prophet like unto Moses, the blessing of the Father, life for evermore, for Himself and all those for whom He died and rose again. He must have died a mortal man without the in-dwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, for He could not have expired so long as this spirit-influence, which was essential life, abode with Him; and He arose as He died, a mortal man, and the superaddition of spirit-life was a requisite preliminary for any further service on behalf of the Deity. Hence, when He taught the disciples in the way, and their hearts burned within them, unable to resist the spirit-power with which He spoke He was, *in esse*, the Lord the Spirit exalted to inherit the land, crowned with glory and honour. The very words He uses to them imply this phase of His existence - "ought not the Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory;" and then He recommences His work of instruction in righteousness, and eventually vanished from their sight. The same hour these disciples returned to their place in Jerusalem, and told the apostles the fact of His resurrection, and while so speaking Jesus Himself stood in their midst, with the salutation of the Spirit, "Peace be unto you," and when they were terrified and affrighted on the supposition that they were beholding a phantom, or supernatural illusion, and were troubled in their minds at His presence, Jesus said unto them, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see, for a phantom hath not flesh and bones [no mention of blood, observe] as ye see me have." And He shewed them His hands and His feet, which they handled of the Word of life, and He eat before them, and He said unto them, "These are words that I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms concerning me. Then opened he their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." (Luke xxiv.)

All these acts of volition, and of innate power, testify that Jesus was at this period a Son of God in power through spirit of holiness by a resurrection from the dead, for they represent a further ministry of the Lord in an innate development of power which did not appertain to the days of His flesh, and the possession of which could only be the result of a change of nature. Luke evidently alludes to this perfection of being when, in the Acts of the Apostles (1 ch. 2 v.), he makes this reference, "Until the day in which he (Jesus) was taken up after that he through, or in, Holy Spirit had given commandments unto the apostles whom He had chosen." Here His personal glorification is strongly inferred previous to the

ending of the forty days of his sojourn on earth after His resurrection, or rather, I should say, at the beginning of these days, since whatsoever He spake by way of commandment or for impartation of spiritual knowledge was of Holy Spirit, of His own essence, the life power of the Father Spirit in Him, the peculiar nature of His substance, and the anointing oil of gladness wherewith He was anointed above His fellows (the prophets), in token that the Father had begotten Him from the dead as His beloved Son, in whom He was well pleased, and had highly exalted Him to be both Lord and Christ.

The slightest consideration of the features of the Messiahship must determine that His fleshly work was connected with His suffering in mortality, and ended with the pouring out of His soul unto death; and that His spiritual work is connected with His glory, and could not begin until He had passed from death unto life, and could exercise in the Divine Nature all power in heaven and in earth, as the Father's representative, in administering the finished work of His fleshly righteousness for the purposes of Adamic regeneration, so that His being perfected on the day of His resurrection to seal the truth of the Word of the Deity became a divine necessity, for only in this state could He commune officially with His apostles, and instruct them in the things of the kingdom of God, and prepare them for the ministry of the Word in His name of salvation; and this divine necessity is demonstrated to us, as every other doctrine of the truth is, in the wisdom of the Word, rightly reasoned out of its Scriptures, to ascertain the mind of the Spirit in its typical, prophetic, and narrative revealings.

DAVID BROWN, London.  
(To be continued.)

---

## STILL ON THY LOVING HEART.

STILL on thy loving heart let me repose,  
Jesus, sweet Author of my joy and rest;  
O let me pour my sorrows, cares, and woes  
Into Thy true and sympathising breast!  
Thy love grows never cold, but its pure flame  
Seems every day more strong and bright to glow:  
Thy truth remains eternally the same,  
Pure and unsullied as the mountain snow.

O what is other love compared with Thine!  
Of such high value, such eternal worth!  
What is man's love compared with love divine,  
Which never changes in this changing earth,  
Love, which in this cold world grows never cold;  
Love, which decays not with the world's decay;  
Love, which is young when all things else grow old,  
Which lives when heaven and earth shall pass away?

How little love unchangeable and fixed  
In this dark valley doth to man remain!  
With what unworthy motive is it mixed!  
How full of grief, uncertainty, and pain!  
Love is the object which attracts all eyes:  
We win it, and already fear to part;  
A thousand rivals watch to seize the prize,  
And tear the precious idol from our heart.

But Thou, in spite of our offences past,  
And those, alas! which still in us are found,  
Hast loved us, Jesus, with a love so vast,  
No span can reach it, and no plummet sound.  
Though the poor love we give Thee in return  
Should be extinguished, Thine is ever true;

Its vestal fire eternally doth burn,  
Though everlasting, always fresh and new.

Thou, who art ever ready to embrace  
All those who truly after Thee inquire;  
Thou, who hast promised in Thy heart a place  
To all who love Thee, and a place desire,  
O Lord, when I am anxious and deprest,  
And dim with tears, mine eyes can hardly see,  
O let me lean upon Thy faithful breast,  
Rejoicing that e'en I am loved by Thee!

---

## THE ONLY BEGOTTEN SON OF GOD.

ADAM, who was created by the Elohim out of the dust of the ground, is declared by Luke to be the Son of God. Some of the antediluvians were sons of God on the principle of faith. The Jewish nation is also collectively styled God's son. "Out of Egypt have I called my son," (Hos. xi. 1). We also read that the sons of God assembled themselves together in the time of Job, while in the days of the ministration of Jesus and the apostles many sons (and daughters) were called out by the Gospel of the Kingdom, both Jewish and Gentile, and were adopted by the Lord God Almighty, so that John could exclaim with the fervour and enthusiasm of his nature, "Now are we the sons of God." Here, then, we have a multitude of sons, selected or taken out from the descendants of Adam, styled "Sons of God." Of all these sons, save Adam (and him only by creation), not one could claim for his father any other than a member of the human race, essentially mortal, the subject of sin, disease, and ultimate death. Though sons of God, none of them could by any means "redeem his brother" from death, "nor give to God a ransom for him," that he should not see corruption. But Deity had promised to ransom Israel from the power of the grave (Hos. xiii. 14), to save His people from their sins, and deliver them from the hands of their enemies. Hence we find it recorded, "When the fulness of time came " that God sent forth His "only begotten Son," "made of a woman," as "a ransom for many," to take away "the sin of the world." Here, then, we have one, distinguished from all other sons in that He is the ONLY begotten Son. It behoves us, therefore, to give this remarkable fact due weight, and to remember that, so far as an actual son of God is concerned, the Deity has revealed but ONE: and it is this One, we are told by the Apostle Paul, who INHERITED a more excellent name than 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 in the first begotten into the world, He saith, And let all the angels of God worship Him." (Heb. i. 5, 6.) The fact of Him being begotten by Deity is both a scriptural and satisfactory reason why He Merited His Father's name, being so far superior to the angels that they could consistently worship or do homage to Him. There is manifested on the part of some a false delicacy which induces a reluctance to acknowledge that He was literally descended from His Father, yet, if we would receive the testimony with childlike faith, believing "the record God has given us of His Son," it is impossible to avoid this conclusion; and, however improbable or impossible it may appear, it ill becomes us, as Christadelphians, expecting His return at any day, to disbelieve what is plainly taught concerning Him. The question has, until recently, been avoided by the majority as an intricate subject, but now the time appears to have arrived for a conscientious and faithful examination of it, and, in so doing, let us receive the testimony with "readiness of mind," esteeming Him faithful who has given us His word for our edification and comfort.

We will assume, then, that which is undeniably taught, viz., that Jesus was the only begotten Son of God, who inherited a more excellent name than the angels, though, so far as substance is concerned, He was made a little lower than they, for the suffering of death. (Heb. i. 4, ii. 9.)

It is admitted that He was the heir to David's throne, for we read, "The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David." His genealogy is also given, through His grandfather Heli, to establish a legal claim thereto, according to Jewish law. These facts are universally admitted by the brotherhood, and need not to be recapitulated or enlarged upon. It is rather to His relation as David's "Lord," and David's "Root," that we wish more especially to dilate on.

As Matthew and Luke give His genealogy according to flesh, to John we must turn more especially for an account of his paternal origin, and for the record of those results which ensue therefrom; and from his testimony we shall find that Jesus had a just claim to David's throne, not only from the fact of His being David's son and heir, but as his "Lord" and "Root" it was His, as all things are the property of their Creator. The first few lines of John's Gospel trace his origin to the fountain of life, the Creator of heaven and earth; and, indeed, more than this, it identifies Him with it as the one who, "In the beginning was the Word," which was "with God," and "was God." "By Him," he continues, "were all things made that were made," and, "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men;" this light shone in the darkness and the darkness comprehended it not. Here we pause and consider that it was Jesus who was this "true light" shining in the darkness of the Jewish commonwealth, and who was by it rejected, condemned, and crucified: thus He who was in the beginning "with God," and who was God," "came to His own land, and His own people received Him not," but crucified the Lord of Glory, and the Prince of Life. (1 Cor. 11. 8; Acts iii. 15.) Is it not seen that the inspired Apostles, both John and Paul, identify him as the "Jehovah," in affirming that He "was God," that "all things were made by Him," "that He was in the world, and the world was made by Him," etc., and many other equally plain and positive testimonies, all of them arising from, and growing out of, His preternatural begetting, by which the "Word" was veiled in Abrahamic flesh, "and dwelt among us." The Word thus veiled was named, by the Angel Gabriel, Jesus. The Jews were, like many in our day, quite willing to acknowledge Him as a man. "Is not this," said they, "Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know, how is it then he saith, I came down from heaven?" (John vi. 42.) And we may well ask the same question if, as some so earnestly contend, He never did. But He declares to those faithless Jews that the Royal Majesty of the heavens was among them; not merely a man of the earth, earthy, but the Word veiled in flesh, constituting the only begotten Son of God, full of favour and truth.

When we consider Jesus we should look beyond simple flesh, and, with the eye of a faith predicated on the testimony, we ought to see into the dim distance of eternity, and behold the ever-existent "Logos," who, in the days of Herod, "came to His own" land, and as a shining light gave power to as many as received Him to become the sons of God. Jesus was He (veiled in flesh, yet none the less He), hence those sorrowful words uttered by Him when contemplating the city of David whose varied vicissitudes of fortune, arising from the stubbornness of her people, excited His profound pity: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not." (Luke xiii. 34.) These it has been said, are not the words of the man who uttered them, who had never sought to "gather" Israel, but rather had avoided any opportunity He may have had for so doing. This sentiment would be true did the scriptures reveal Jesus as flesh, and flesh only, whose existence simply dated back to His birth of Mary, and it is not strange that such an interpretation should be put on these words of Jesus by those who view Him as such; but it has been demonstrated from the scriptures that Jesus was more than flesh; He is to be identified with the Word or "Logos," whose existence dated back into eternity, and who, coming into the world He had made, offered eternal life to as many as would receive Him.

Again, we say, this is Jesus, the only begotten Son of God, who Himself uttered the words above referred to, and who prayed the Father to glorify Him with the glory He had with Him before the world was. (John xvii. 5.) Upon what authority are His words wrested from their obvious meaning, to accommodate a theory which makes Him nothing but flesh, and, therefore, non-existent until born of the Virgin Mary? He declared to an excited multitude of rabid Jews, in reply to their query as to whether He was greater than their father, Abraham, that "Abraham rejoiced to see my day, and was glad." This was too much for them; and even for some of the "Israelites indeed" of this age it is a puzzle: but He only added fuel to their incredulity, "Thou art not yet fifty years old," replied they, "and hast thou seen Abraham?" The argument, it will be observed, here turned upon a question of antiquity, but Jesus did not shrink from answering it. "Before Abraham was, I am," said He. "Then took they up stones to cast at Him." (John viii. 53-59.) We are all aware how these passages have been tortured, and what labour has been bestowed in getting around them, by rejecting or modifying their obvious meaning, all of which may be avoided by realising that it was not flesh alone which was named Jesus, but the "Word," or Logos, veiled in the flesh of David's daughter. Here is a combination which, to many is extremely repugnant, hence their endeavours to prove the contrary by the wresting of a few isolated passages in the Hebrews, which they quote to prove Him not one whit superior to ourselves, notwithstanding Paul's emphatic treatment of the subject in his other writings, and even in this same epistle, where, among other things, he contrasts Him favourably with the angels and quotes the following testimony as applying "to Him: "And thou, Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands. (1 ch. 10 v.) To the Colossians he declares substantially the same: "For by Him were all things

created.” (1 ch. 16 v.) Thus agreeing precisely with what John affirms, viz.: “All things were made by Him;” and again, “He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not.” (John i. 3-10.)

The ingenious speculations, and plausible theories emanating from the flesh, must give way before the attestations of the scriptures, for they are supreme. When we consider the modesty displayed by Paul, who, in a personal interview with the Lord Jesus Christ, was by Him divinely authorised, as an apostle, “to bear His name before the Gentiles,” and yet, on all subsequent occasions, invariably appealed to Moses and the Prophets in support of his assertions, when we note his deference for the testimony, it is hard to realize the singular audacity of men in our day, who do not hesitate to give their speculations in “the deep things of the Spirit” to the public with the least amount of scriptural evidence possible, and, indeed, in some cases, with none at all. In reference to such, we may well quote the saying of the Prophet “Cease ye from man whose breath is in his nostrils,” however wise he may be in his own estimation, “for wherein is he to be accounted of.” (Isaiah ii. 22.) And, again, “If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.” (1 Peter iv. n.) And this, more especially, is the contemplation of God’s only begotten Son, of whom, Paul wrote to the Hebrews, he had “many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing” (ch. v. 11).

W. A. HARRIS.

[There is much in this article that we believe and admire, but we are not prepared to endorse the pre-existence of Jesus. The Spirit, of whom He was begotten, is certainly without beginning, but not the only begotten Son. - EDITOR.]

---

## ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

**THE SENSE IN WHICH JESUS CHRIST WAS RICH AND BECAME POOR.** – in 2 Cor. viii. 9, we read, “For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.” In what did the riches of Jesus Christ consist, and how are we benefitted by His giving them up? An answer to the above question (through the Christadelphian Lamp) will much oblige - A. B. C.

**Answer:** - The riches of Jesus Christ consisted in His ability to redeem His brethren by giving His life for them a thing which no son of Adam could do. Psalm xlix 7. To assert that Jesus the Christ was a son of Adam, and as poor by birth as those He gave His life to redeem, is to contradict His own and His Father’s testimony, that He was the Christ, the Son of the living God. Jesus had life in Himself, and also the authority from His Father to lay it down, and the promise of soon receiving it again. “He was rich in faith and obedience, and could say to His Father, I have glorified Thee on the earth.” “I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do.” He was rich in love for the lost and sin stricken children of men, and could say truthfully, I have come to seek and to save that which was lost. “As the Father hath loved me, even so have I loved you.” “I am the good Shepherd. The good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep.” In the fulness of His riches, which an Apostle describes as unsearchable, the Christ became poor. He was not a son of Adam, but humbled Himself to die as if He had been one. He was not a blasphemer, but He allowed Himself to die the death due to one. He did not rebel against the Roman emperor, but was put to death as a rebel. He had not broken the Law of Moses, yet He was cursed by it in the manner of His death. Jesus died the death due to a rebellious blasphemer, and thus He became poor. On the morning of the third day, the Father reversed the unjust sentence passed upon Him, for it was not possible that He could lie under it. His claim to be the Christ, the Son of the living God, has been confirmed by a change from flesh and blood into spirit consubstantial with His Father, from being exposed to the malice of wicked men to be the supreme Lord and judge of every power that exists, whether in this age or that which is to come. In virtue of this exaltation God has been graciously pleased to invite all men everywhere, though hopelessly poor in the old Adam, to put on the name of Jesus the Christ, the new or second Adam, and thus become heirs of all that He possesses, heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ, of an inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and that cannot pass away.

W. E.

C. J. R. - The patterns of things in the heavens mentioned in Heb. ix. 23, include the priesthood as well as the altars and various vessels of the service. The ceremonial law, with all its belongings, constituted the

type, form, or pattern of the knowledge and of the truth which it shadowed forth. The heavenly things themselves are the kingly priests of the age to come, who, if they lived before Jesus Christ came, saw his day afar off, and were glad; or if contemporary with Him, discerned Him to be the Christ, the Son of the living God; or if after He was raised from the dead, and exalted to the unchangeable priesthood, by the faith have been exalted to the heavenlies in Christ Jesus, purified by His one sacrifice, which was better than any of the patterns given from the foundation of the world

W. E.

---

## NOTE ON MATTHEW X. 15.

“When Jesus sent forth His twelve Apostles to preach the kingdom of heaven and to heal the sick, He denounced whosoever should not receive them nor hear their words, declaring that the doom of such would be more dreadful than that of Sodom and Gomorrah.

The common version of the New Testament makes the Saviour point to a future retribution of the cities of the plain, but as they suffered “vengeance” by the immediate infliction of the Almighty, we have no ground for believing that their inhabitants will be the subjects of resurrection, and therefore the words of the Lord cannot be understood as relating to judgment to come. He instances the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah to illustrate or enforce what he was advancing, as is evident from an amended translation of the verse. Rotherham gives it thus: “Verily I say unto you, it will be more tolerable for a land of Sodom and Gomorrah in a day of judgment than for that city.” That is, even upon a land as wicked as that of Sodom and Gomorrah, judgment will be less terrible than upon those who refuse to listen to the ambassadors of the Anointed of God.

Of nine versions that have been consulted in four living languages, that of Rotherham is the only one which adheres strictly to the Greek text, marking by the use of the indefinite a the absence of the article in the original.

Mark vi. 11 and Luke x. 12, as well as Matt. xi. 22 and Luke x. 14, where reference is made to Tyre and Sidon, must also be received in the acceptance contended for. Drs. Hammond and Wakefield apply Matt. xi. 22, “to a day of temporal punishment.”

SCRUTATOR.

---

## THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

To all who are earnestly looking for “the Sign of the Son of Man in the Heaven,” there is nothing relating to the present condition of the Holy Land, or City, which can fail of being interesting. Such as have their faces Zion-ward “pray for the peace of Jerusalem,” and “take pleasure in her stones, and favour the dust thereof,” for they believe the “glorious things spoken of the City of God” as recorded in the Prophets and in the Psalms. The signs of Jerusalem’s exaltation are also the signs that their redemption draweth nigh. Let us, then, take a glance eastward, toward the sun-rising, and note what is passing in the Lord’s land, which has so long lain desolate and uncared for.

Great numbers are daily landing on its shores, and tourists are visiting it in increasing numbers, so that it is fast becoming as beaten a track as the Continent of Europe.

The Jewish Chronicle of March 6th says, “The enormous immigration of Russian and Polish Jews goes on without intermission. Last autumn every Russian boat from Odessa, and every Austrian boat from Trieste, brought forty or fifty families. Among these were several rich men, who immediately on their arrival bought ground and built houses, especially outside the city, near the gate, on both sides of the Jaffa road, so that a new suburb, in fact a ‘new Jerusalem’ is springing up here. The finest houses belong to our co-religionists. It would be a happy thing for Jerusalem if there were sufficient rich persons in the city itself to obviate the constant appeals to Europe for relief.”

“The Palestine Exploration Expedition, under the direction of Lieut. Drake is pursuing its investigations in the environs of Jerusalem. It has been working hard for several months with creditable energy. About the end of last year, Mr. Claremont Ganneau, the celebrated young French archaeologist, arrived here. This is the savant who discovered the Mesha stone. A Mr. Lecomte, who is a friend of M. Ganneau and who is also sent by the Exploration Fund, came with Him. These two gentlemen, with some

others, have recently been exploring the neighbourhood of Jericho, where they found several highly interesting relics relating to the history of the Jewish race and faith. Among these were stones bearing inscriptions, coins, weapons, vessels, utensils, etc. All of seem to belong to the glorious days of the Jewish people.”

“One of the direst wants of Jerusalem is water. In the rainy season this want of the first necessity of life is not so severely felt as towards the end of the dry season, when the tanks and cisterns are nearly empty, and the residue is a foul-smelling fluid, far different from European notions of water. Efforts again and again have been made to supply the Holy City with an efficient water supply. Alas! all these efforts have been unavailing, and it was but last month that our Jerusalem correspondent wrote us to the effect that the great services rendered to the municipality of Jerusalem by Youssouf Effendi, in attempts to build an aqueduct, were also likely to be unavailing. Again we hear of another effort being made to remedy the scarcity of water in Jerusalem. The Levant Herald says: “According to a local paper, a rich English lady is about to cause the construction, at her own cost, of a handsome aqueduct, for the purpose of providing the city of Jerusalem with a good supply of water, which, in common with Constantinople, it much needs. The scheme will involve an outlay of £25,000, and an engineer is now engaged upon the plans, which will be submitted to the Porte when they are completed, in order to obtain its authority for the execution of the project. We fervently hope, for the sake of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, that this report be true. We, however, fear that no permanent practical good can be done until the Porte specially guarantees protection against the wilful destruction of the aqueduct, and other portions of the water supply, by the nomadic Arab tribes.”

THE JEWS OF RUSSIA. - At last it appears as if the oppression and hardships to which the Jewish subjects of the Emperor Alexander II. are subjected are approaching their end. Several restrictive laws have for a long time past pressed severely on them; these are, however, being removed, slowly it is true, but surely. Within the past month another grievance has been removed. The Czar has promulgated a decree, with the idea of realising the scheme which his Imperial Majesty is well known to have at heart, viz, the bringing of his subjects under one general law of compulsory military service. The Jews will greatly benefit by the new system, for they will in this respect be on an equal footing with their fellow subjects, and will no longer be debarred from promotion, which hitherto they have been unable to obtain; no Jew, however long and faithfully he may have served, having been allowed to rise from the ranks. Now that advancement in the army is permitted to Jewish soldiers, there is no reason why Jewish civilians should not be permitted to rise from their present unsatisfactory position, equally with their fellow countrymen.

The great reformer of his empire, the Emperor Alexander II., says the *Allgemeine Zeitung des Jiulenthums*, in an article on the subject, presented his people on the 1st of January with a new law, the groundwork of which is the principle of the duty of every Russian to defend his country. No one acquainted with the development of European nations and states will deny what great progress is comprehended in the law, but also at the same time what fruitful ground it affords for the further development of national existence. In this law we realize that which we for so many years hoped and strove for. In this law we find no *Kromin Lewriew*, no such phrase as “The Jews excepted.” We hail this as a great victory for the good cause, as a new and significant guarantee that the magnanimous Emperor will grant to his Jewish subjects equality with all those of other nationalities and religions. The new law assigns to the Russian Jews equal duties and equal rights. All exceptional laws concerning the laws in regard to the duty of carrying the flag for the Emperor and fatherland are repealed. Every lawful impediment to their promotion has been removed.”

These items of intelligence show that the land of Israel is rising in importance, and that the Jews are recovering their civil rights and privileges.

The troublesome Eastern question, as it is called, is once more coming into prominence, and threatening the peace of the world. A rather startling article recently appeared in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, one of the most influential of the German papers, to the effect that the preservation of the Turkish Empire is not a dogma with Germany, and that if Germany and Russia should desire to transform the whole map of Eastern Europe, no one would prevent them.

An article which has caused a profound sensation in France, seems to imply that the German Empire has come to the same conclusion as the Russian came to twenty-one years ago, when Czar Nicholas told Sir Hamilton Seymour that the “sick man” was sick unto death, and that the time was come to divide his possessions. Probably the announcement has a specific object. At the present moment the Emperor of Austria, who feels himself endangered by the enormous armies to the north and the west of him, is at St. Petersburg, hoping to bring about an alliance with the Czar in the not improbable event of Bismarck yielding to the pan-Germanic party, and attempting to annex the German provinces of the Austro-

Hungarian kingdom. It is likely enough that Bismarck does not approve of their rapprochement, and is now seeking to prevent it by offering Russia a huge bribe in the form of free leave to do what she pleases in Turkey. The Augsburg paper goes on to declare that the objects of Russia and Germany are identical - to civilise Europe, and that there never was so favourable time as the present for carrying it out. Let Russia, says another German paper, the Frankfort Gazette, have Turkey, provided only that a Kingdom of Roumania, with a Hohenzollern at the head of it, be established. That is the offer which is made to the Czar. At the same time the Emperor-King is warned that there never can be any real friendship between him and the Czar, that an alliance between Russia and Austro-Hungary must always be hypocritical. Thus in the plainest terms an invitation is given by the statesman at Berlin to the descendant of Peter the Great to fulfil that monarch's famous will and testament. Franco, it is supposed, will be able to offer no resistance; England, it is perhaps assumed, will either not care or dare to do so. Now is the time to re-arrange the map of Europe. It remains to be seen how Czar Alexander will meet this proposal. It is understood that he will come to this country very shortly, and the event, taken in connection with the recent marriage of his daughter to Queen Victoria's second son, may be supposed to imply that he desires to maintain friendly relations with England. But so did his father, provided England would let him do what he wanted. When he found that this was not to be, he made war. It is possible that war may be averted on the present occasion, though when we consider that the armies of the Great Powers are bigger than they ever were before, that they are running races with each other to see which can be armed with the most deadly weapon in the shortest time, the prospect is not very hopeful. Moreover, there is at least one statesman who scruples at nothing, at least one who would not hesitate to plunge the Continent into seas of blood, in order to consolidate the political Babylon which he has built. There is, too, another nation thirsting for revenge, weary of incessant bullying, and would rejoice to place her sword at the service of that statesman's foe. The prospect is very dark and troubled. Not even Mr. Hammond, were he still at the Foreign Office, would venture to congratulate the new Foreign Minister, at his accession, upon the calmness of the atmosphere, and the clearness of the horizon, as he congratulated the outgoing Foreign Minister when he came into office in June, 1870. Lord Derby told us seven years ago that he passed a sleepless night in thinking about the Luxemburg difficulty. We fear that in going back to his old post he is preparing for himself not one, but many, such nights, when he will be inclined to envy the seaboy asleep on the giddy mast.

S. G. H.

-----

## INTELLIGENCE.

**BIRMINGHAM.** - Bro. F. S. Jones reports the obedience by baptism of Charles Frederick Atkins, aged 50, shoemaker, formerly Unitarian. He had attended the meetings at the Temperance Hall for some years, but had not until lately seen the necessity of putting on Christ by immersion.

**GLASGOW.** - Bro. Fleming announces the immersion of William Hunter, formerly Wesleyan Methodist, who was brought to a knowledge of the truth through the instrumentality of Bro. Kerr, and the reading of some books lent him by the brethren. He also mentions the visit of two sisters, formerly members of the meeting in Paisley, but at present residing in a village called Kilborchan, where they are almost isolated, since they adopted the view concerning the Christ set forth by Bro. Turney in his lecture on the Sacrifice of Christ.

**LEICESTER.** - 12, Horsefair Street, Leicester, May 9th, 1874. - Dear Editor and Brother, Since my communication of last month our number has been increased by the addition of Mr. Isaac Wilkinson, of this town. He was immersed some 25 years ago, and was then well acquainted with Dr. Thomas, through whose instrumentality, I believe, the truth was brought to his notice. He has been a looker-on in the matter of the late controversy, but has never been able to see, so far as I can learn, that Jesus could be brought under the condemnation hanging over our race without doing violence to the scriptures. The lectures which I inform you last month were arranged to be given here by Bro. Handley, on the 19th April, Bro. Hayes, on the 26th, and Bro. Nichols, on May 3rd, came off in due course; attendance, on the whole, good, so much so that we are encouraged to persevere in our efforts to make the truth heard: that, however, is our duty, irrespective of results, since the increase is not in our hands to command. Bro. Handley's two lectures, at Loughborough, on Monday and Tuesday, April 20th and 21st, were given in accordance with announcement, the subjects being: "The popular belief concerning the devil and hell shown to be opposed to the scriptures," and, "Do the clergy (established or dissenting) preach the same Gospel as did Jesus and His Apostles." Both nights the attendance was good, the second somewhat the

best; great attention was manifested, and some expressed a desire to hear more in the like direction. That desire will be gratified, God willing, as we have taken the room for about eleven Sunday evenings following the opening lectures, and with the cooperation of the Nottingham brethren, it is intended to endeavour to open the eyes of those who now are "sitting in darkness," and, consequently, "in the shadow of death; "it is to be hoped that some, at least, will allow the light to shine into their minds, and lay hold on the hope set before them. A little discussion was raised at the close of each lecture by friends of orthodoxy, so called. One very persistent individual seemed much disappointed that the lecturer could not tell him who it was (if not the devil of orthodoxy) that tempted Jesus in the wilderness; he was not content with being shown that Peter was on one occasion a Satan, and Judas a devil, therefore making it by no means a necessity that the tempter should be more than human. Two Sunday evening lectures have been given since then; the attendance, though not large, has been marked by interest on the part of the listeners. A writer in the Loughborough Monitor and News of April 23rd, affected surprise that the Directors of the Town Hall should let their room for the purpose of having their creed pulled to pieces by any obscure individuals who could raise the means of taking their room, suggesting that it was not only the wrong thing that was preached, but the wrong place to set it forth. The arguments of the writer were scarcely worth a shot, but I sent a few lines of reply, more with the view of enlisting attention than of combating his sorry arguments. The result, generally, of giving battle in such cases is to get the editorial door slammed in your face, just when you would give your antagonist the coup de grace. We have Bro. W. Clement, of the Mumbles, coming here to spend two Sundays with us, and lecture three times. Of the results I hope to send a good account next month. – Yours in hope of the consolation of Israel, - CHAS. WEALE.

**LONDON.** - Bro. Dan. Brown, writing May 9th, says the members of the Ecclesia meeting in Church Street, Islington, are striving together for the furtherance of the truth, and are in expectation of having shortly two additions to their number. Two lectures have been delivered by Bro. Watts, which were fairly attended. His subject on Sunday evening, April 26th, was, Resurrection; and on May 3rd, "The promises made unto the Fathers."

**MUMBLES,** May 8th, 1874. - Dear Bro. Turney, - In last month's intelligence I said I thought that some would soon follow Bro. Richard Bennett's example. I rejoice in stating that his father, Thomas Bennett, was this evening immersed into the undefiled Christ of the scriptures. He is 54 years of age, and carries on the business of ship-building in this village. He was in early life a strict Churchman, but after many years hearing and reading, and judging for himself, he has come to the conclusion that we are right, and has become one of us. Also at the same time, Samuel Johns, a native of this place. After having spent many years in America, and followed the business of a stonecutter, he returned home nearly three years ago, and was attracted to our Synagogue by hearing that we believed and preached strange things. However after carefully listening to what he heard, he followed the example of the noble Bereans, by searching the scriptures to see if the things he heard were correct, and, believing them to be the truth, he desired and was baptised into the Christ of the scriptures. He is the husband of Sister Johns, and is 32 years of age. Our prayer is that they may be made useful to us, so that we, they, and all the sons of the Deity may have a glorious entrance into His kingdom. We now number twenty, and, like Paul, there is good reason for us to thank God and take courage. Fully convinced we are that if the brethren everywhere would take good heed to the Apostle's advice to the church at Philippi, i. 27. 28, more prosperity would attend our labours. I remain, yours in the one hope, on behalf of the ecclesia, WILLIAM CLEMENT.

**NOTTINGHAM.** - We have the pleasure to announce the immersion of Mr. Alfred Disbrow Eaves, aged 47, formerly belonging to the Church of England, and for several years Churchwarden at Sneinton, near Nottingham. On Wednesday evening, April 22nd, a tea meeting was held in the Synagogue, to welcome Bro. Turney on his return from a seven months' sojourn on the Continent for the benefit of his health, which has been much improved by the change. There was a large gathering on the occasion, - 140 sat down to tea, and several came in afterwards. The tables were tastefully decorated with flowers and evergreens and at the end of the room was a device in the form of a shield, constructed of ivy leaves, with the word "WELCOME" in the centre, on a white ground, the cunning work of some of the sisters. After a few introductory remarks by Bro. Hayes who acted as chairman on the occasion Bro. Turney was called upon and gave his impressions of France and the French people during his stay among them, which was listened to by the brethren and sisters and others assembled with much interest; Appropriate addresses were also given by Brethren Handley and Ellis. After a very agreeable evening the proceedings were brought to a close in the usual way, by the singing of anthems and prayer." The following lectures have been delivered in the Synagogue since our last issue: Sunday evening, April 19th, Salvation is of the Jews, Bro. Watts; April 26th, The Lord's Second Appearing and the Restoration of all things, Bro. Handley; May 3rd, Life and inheritance through Christ, Bro. Turney; May 10th, Spirit Teaching and Spirit

Manifestations, Bro. Hayes. The Ecclesia has suffered the loss of one member by death, in the person of Bro. Balm, who expired after rather a short illness, and was buried in the General Cemetery on May 1st, Bro. Hayes officiating. There was a large attendance of mourners at the grave, many of them belonging to the factory at which our late brother was employed, and advantage was taken of this circumstance to bring before them the true hope of the Christian as taught in the scriptures, in opposition to the Gospel nullifying traditions of the apostasy.

#### **EXTRACTS FROM FOREIGN LETTERS**

**BROOKLYN, UNITED STATES.** - Bro. W.T. Ennis writes: - "The truth is progressing in this country. The meeting in Brooklyn is held at 388, Myrtle Avenue. Visiting brethren and sisters are cordially invited to attend; the meetings commence at 2.30 p.m. The hope of the high calling is the only thing we have to encourage us in this day of trial and adversity; for we know of a surety that if we be Christ's, then are we Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promises; the realization of which we wait patiently day by day, praying that Christ will come and receive His chosen people. Then the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdom of Christ and His people. Every event that happens in Europe, which seems to point to the nearer approach of that time, is hailed with great joy by us, and we hope, with you, to "sit down and eat of that new bread and new wine which Christ shall give us."

**COOMS CORNER, CRAWFORD COUNTY.** - Bro. F. H. Dunn writes: - "The Adamic condemnation theory (as set forth in the Christadelphian), I never believed; neither that Jesus was sin's flesh, but the likeness or form of it. For eight years I have taught that all who die under the condemnation of Adam do not come out of the dust, but only the two classes that die in Christ. This doctrine, I am happy to say, is fast gaining ground.

**RIVERSIDE,** Feb. 6, 1874. - We, as believers of the "one faith," desire now to make known, after diligent study of the present agitated subject, our hearty endorsement of, and sympathy with, those of our brethren in Great Britain whose fellowship is based upon the glorious truth of an uncondemned Christ. We, therefore, reject the views advocated of late in the Christadelphian as unscriptural, and rendering the sacrifice of Christ of none effect. We accept Jesus as the indirect Son of Man, but through His DIVINE paternity the direct Son of God, whereas we admit our full relationship to Adam as our natural father, and that we are only sons of God by adoption. The life of Jesus was free because it came from an uncondemned source, whereas our lives were forfeited as coming from a condemned source; our Lord was thereby enabled "to give up His life a ransom for us," and "deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." In view of the above truths, we do from this present time sincerely hope that we may eventually unite on this sublime doctrine, which exhibits to us more fully the goodness of the Deity, and causes us to love and honour the Son as we honour the Father. We have no desire to compromise the truth with any, and are ever ready to vindicate the same.

---

### **A REPRESENTATIVE BUT NOT A SUBSTITUTE.**

In the May number of the Christadelphian, the Editor affirms that Christ was not our substitute but our representative. In Webster's large Dictionary, under the word Representative, the following is given as its signification: - "An agent, deputy, or substitute." Under the word Substitute, we find this: - "One who, or that which, is substituted or put in the place of another."

