

Christadelphian Lamp

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

Vol. 1.

OCTOBER, 1874

No. 12.

CONTENTS

Page 2	Enlargement for Next Year	Editor
Page 3	A Treatise on the Two Sons of God (Continued)	Editor
Page 9	The Deluge	Joseph Wood
Page 16	The Glorification of The Christ - Continued	Bro. David Brown
Page 18	A Spiritual Sale	Poem from Punch
Page 19	Letters to The Editor	
Page 25	A Political Terror	
Page 27	Intelligence	
Page 32	Extracts from Foreign Letters	
Page 33	A Murmur of Doubt and Fear from Afar	Editor

"It is by faith in Christ the natural born heir of the Deity, that we are adopted into His Father's family; "for ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ." Gal.iii.26. "God sent forth His Son . . . that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. iv. 4, 5. Whence it is plain that apart from such adoption we are not sons; and if not sons we are not free, and not being free we are in bondage. But the Deliverer was never in bondage. God sent forth His Son, not His slave, and through Him we are received into the family. This Son's relationship to us arose out of the circumstance of Him being "made of a woman." His being "under law" was needful that he might be proved as those who were under it. To be "under law" is not to be cursed by law, as some erroneously imagine; but to be placed so for trial and perfection. Adam was "under law" while obedient; but while obedient, he was not in bondage. Bondage results from breaking the law we are under, not from keeping it. The Redeemer, therefore, having scrupulously kept the law under which He was born was free from all condemnation.

**Withhold not good from them to whom it is due,
when it is thine hand to do it.**

Proverbs 3:27

ENLARGEMENT FOR NEXT YEAR

The present issue reminds us that one year has passed away since the first number of THE CHRISTADELPHIAN LAMP made its appearance. First of all, we beg to thank its friends, contributors, and subscribers, and to inform them that, considering the circumstances under which it came into being, and the prejudice which it has had to face, its success has been wonderful, and still increases. We now propose to enlarge its pages from demy to medium octavo, so as to give room for a greater variety of subjects. The size will be similar to that of Dr. Thomas's Herald; the double columns will remind our friends - who were the Doctor's friends too - of the appearance of that much-admired periodical; we will also do our best to keep alive its fine expository spirit, besides furnishing matter of interest for which the Doctor had not space, the Herald being only 24 pages, whereas the Lamp consists of 48 pages. With regard to those sneers and threats which accompanied its birth, - sneers about "bad oil" and "not enough to last;" threats about "extinguishing it," and so forth, we shall say nothing, except that, at present, they come under the head of unfulfilled prophecy. As there is still "oil" in store, and no intimation that THE CHRISTADELPHIAN LAMP has disappointed its readers, we propose to continue its existence. We have no change of policy to announce. The wisdom of "hearing both sides" has been proved during twelve months; we shall therefore allow those who differ, as well as those who agree, to have their say, and endeavour to present an impartial conclusion from the evidence adduced. We are not "content to measure our circulation by the truth;" our aim being to enlighten, by a wider and wider circulation, those who do not understand the truth; neither can we be persuaded that those who believe they have the truth, have the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Further investigation, and discussion in a proper spirit are, therefore, necessary for the benefit of all; but we shall not bind ourselves to reply to every absurd or false statement.

While we are connected with THE CHRISTADELPHIAN LAMP it will be our endeavour to make it answer well to the title it bears, and to shed the light of Divine truth all around, not forgetting the necessity for so doing in a dignified and becoming manner.

The original size of THE CHRISTADELPHIAN LAMP was 36 pages. The cost of postage was then a halfpenny. Twelve pages extra were added, which doubled the postage; but, notwithstanding this increase of size and expense no additional charge was made. The American postage has been very heavy and we are glad to hear that the American brethren will not object to our proposed advance in price for 1874. It will be seen that 4d. was very low for a magazine of the size, quality of material, and workmanship, like THE LAMP. The reader has had the benefit of this liberality for the time being. We now think THE LAMP ought to make some approach towards paying its own way. With a view to this it is proposed to add two shillings per annum, making the price 6s a year instead of 4s. This trifling charge can hurt no one, while on the whole circulation it will materially help to pay the printer's bill. Two dollars gold will be the price for America. This change is intended to be final. If a paper gives satisfaction to its readers - and our circulation and correspondence indicate that THE LAMP does - it surely ought not to be a pauper. But we have no fear that its friends will refuse all reasonable support, seeing that the new price will be so very much below smaller periodicals, and that the sole object of everyone concerned in the enterprise is to shew gratitude to God for the gift of His Son and the glorious inheritance through Him. As to letters and remittances. During our absence abroad Bro. W. H. Farmer and Dr. S. G. Hayes undertook the working of THE LAMP; Bro. Farmer has continued to give attendance to all correspondence till now, and in transferring to us this labour it is only that he may take up other things in the service of our common cause. Having said this much, we commit the future interests of THE LAMP to Him who rules over all.

P.S. The slips enclosed are for convenience. Method is the soul of business. The subscriber will please fill in 1, 2, or more, as the case may be, sign name and address, and return to the Editor.

A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD

(Continued from September, page 8)

ADOPTION CONSIDERED.

CHAPTER VIII. - CONTENTS : Adoption considered - Born again.

“ADOPTION is an action whereby a man takes a person into his family, in order to make him part of it, acknowledges him for his son, and receives him into the number, and gives him a right to the privileges of his children.” - Cruden. The most remarkable instance in Scripture is the adoption of Moses by Pharaoh’s daughter. We have no information at hand concerning the Egyptian law, but probably it did not vary much from the after laws of the Romans in this respect.

“By the old Roman law, the relation of father and son differed little from that of master and slave. Hence, if a person wished to adopt the son of another, the natural father transferred (mancipated) the boy to him by a formal sale before a competent magistrate, such as the praetor at Rome, and in the provinces before the governor. The father thus conveyed all his paternal rights, and the child from that moment became in all legal respects the child of the adoptive father. If the person to be adopted was his own master (*sui juris*), the mode of proceeding was by a legislative act of the people in the *comitia curiatae*. This was called *adrogatio*, from *rogare*, to propose a law. In the case of *adrogatio*, it was required that the adoptive father should have no children, and that he should have no reasonable hopes of any. In either case the adopted child became subject to the authority of his new father; passed into his family, name, and sacred rites, and was capable of succeeding to his property.

Women could not adopt a child, for by adoption the adopted person came into the power, as it was expressed, of the adopter; and as a woman had not the parental power over her own children, she could not obtain it over those of another by any form of proceeding. Under the emperors it became the practice to effect *adrogatio* by an imperial rescript. But this practice was not introduced till after the time of Antonius Pius (A.D. 138-161).

“There was also adoption by testament. C. Julius Caesar thus adopted his great nephew Octavius, until he received the appellation of Augustus, by which he is generally known. But this adoption by testament was not a proper adoption, and Augustus had his testamentary adoption confirmed by a *lex curiata*.

“The legislation of Justinian (*Inst. i. 11*) altered the old law of adoption in several respects. It declares that there are two kinds of adoption: one called *adrogatio*, when by a rescript of the emperor (*principali rescripto*) a person adopts another who is free from parental control; the other, when by the authority of the magistrate (*imperio magistratus*), he who is under the control of his parents is made over by that parent to another person, and adopted by him either as his son, his grandson, or a relation, in any inferior degree. Females also might be adopted in the same manner. But when a man gave his child to be adopted by a stranger, none of the parental authority passed from the natural to the adoptive father; the only effect was that the child succeeded to the inheritance of the latter if he died intestate. It was only when the adopter was the child’s paternal or maternal grandfather, or otherwise so related to him as that the natural law (*naturala jura*) concurred with that of adoption, that the new connexion became in all respects the same with the original one. It was also declared that the adopter should be at least eighteen years older than the person whom he adopted. Women who had lost their own children by death, might, by the indulgence of the emperor, receive those of others in their place!

“Adoption was no part of the old German law: it was introduced into Germany with the Roman law, in the latter part of the middle ages. The general rules concerning adoption in Germany are the same, but there are some variations established by the law of the several states.

“The French law of adoption is contained in eighth title of the first book of the ‘Code Civil.’ The following are its principal pro-visions: Adoption is only permitted to persons above the age of fifty, who have neither children nor other legitimate descendants, and are at least fifteen years older than the individual adopted. It can only be exercised in favour of one who has been an object of the adopter’s constant care, for at least six years during minority, or of one who has saved the life of the adopter in battle, from fire, or from drowning. In the latter cases the only restriction respecting the age of the parties is, that the adopter shall be older than the adopted, and shall have attained his majority, or his twenty-first year; and if married, that his wife is a consenting party. In every case the party adopted must be of the age

of twenty-one. The form is for the two parties to present themselves before the justice of the peace (juge de paix) for the place where the adopter resides, and in his presence to pass an act of mutual consent; after which the transaction, before being accounted valid, must be approved of by the tribunal of first instance within whose jurisdiction the domicile of the adopter is. The adopted takes the name of the adopter in addition to his own; and no marriage can take place between the adopter and either the adopted or his descendants, or between two adopted children of the same individual, or between the adopted and any child who may be afterwards born to the adopter, or between the one party and the wife of the other. The adopted acquires no right of succession to the property of any relation of the adopter; but in regard to the property of the adopter himself, it is declared that he shall have precisely the same right with a child born in wedlock, even although there should be other children born in wedlock after his adoption. It has been decided in the French court that aliens cannot be adopted.

“Adoption is still practised both among the Turks and among the eastern nations. There is no adoption in the English or Scotch law.”

Those of our readers whose access to books is not easy will not be displeased with this epitome of the laws of adoption. It shows that the Creator has spoken to man somewhat in accordance with man’s own measures. Adoption is made a prominent feature by Paul, and it is evident that he treats the subject in several leading particulars in accordance with this digest of Roman law. From the moment of adoption in the gospel sense, as well as in the Roman, the child in all legal respects belongs to the adoptive Father, and is subject to his new Father’s authority. He passes into his family, name, and sacred rites; and is capable of succeeding to his Father’s property.

Prior to this the child might be either the free born son of his natural father, or a slave. In the eye of the gospel of deliverance all the natural born children of Adam are slaves - made slaves by him who was the first sinner, and therefore “made sinners.” “All have sinned (in him) and come short of the glory of God.” We are all sons of God in a certain sense, for He made us and His breath is in our nostrils. But in a spiritual sense we are not His sons, for we have all been sold under sin. In this sense, then, sin is our lord, nor can we be adopted into the family of God except we are first justified by faith from sin.

It is by faith in Christ the natural born heir of the Deity, that we are adopted into His Father’s family; “for ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ.” Gal.iii.26. “God sent forth His Son . . . that we might receive the adoption of sons.” Gal. iv. 4, 5. Whence it is plain that apart from such adoption we are not sons; and if not sons we are not free, and not being free we are in bondage. But the Deliverer was never in bondage. God sent forth His Son, not His slave, and through Him we are received into the family. This Son’s relationship to us arose out of the circumstance of Him being “made of a woman.” His being “under law” was needful that he might be proved as those who were under it. To be “under law” is not to be cursed by law, as some erroneously imagine; but to be placed so for trial and perfection. Adam was “under law” while obedient; but while obedient, he was not in bondage. Bondage results from breaking the law we are under, not from keeping it. The Redeemer, therefore, having scrupulously kept the law under which He was born was free from all condemnation.

Because of adoption “God hath sent forth the spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.” This use of the Syriac word Abba in connexion with the Greek word Pater (father), arising from a habit of the Jews in writing after they became acquainted with Greek, is to be understood from Paul to mean this: he who is adopted can now address God and say, My Lord, and my Father, whereas before adoption he could not so address Him.

When the prophet wrote these words: “After those days saith the Lord I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people,” there was an intended allusion to the adopted “sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty;” as may be seen from Hebrews x., 16. The choice God made of Israel at the first was prospectively an adoption through Christ. Indeed, the necessity of the Creator, He being the Redeemer, to relate Himself by blood to all mankind, which He did through His own Son, proves that Israel were not chosen outside this purpose. He, the One Supreme, is not a Being of blood, therefore His own proper blood could not be poured out, but the blood of His own Son, being styled “His own blood” (Acts xx. 28) constituted the connecting link. That this Son was the hope of the faithful in Israel appears from the saying of Paul concerning Moses, who at manhood refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter, esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt, for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward.

So that, whether we look at the scheme in relation to the Jews or the Gentiles, the truth is manifest that through His Son the Deity predetermined to adopt as many as would receive Him into His own spiritual family, thereby abolishing the slavery under which they were held. The effect of this transfer was complete, being on the basis of justification by faith from all their own past sins as well as from the sin

imputed to them in the Garden of Eden. As for the Jews, they were not merely liberated, as some imagine, from the further observance of their law, which had served the purpose of a schoolmaster to bring them as far as Christ, but were disenthralled, as they required to be like all men, from the first and universal chain.

In this comprehensive view of the condition of mankind the words of John strike us with a peculiar force, producing an effect of gratitude and peace. "As many as received Him, to them gave He power (right or privilege) to become the Sons of God, even to them that believe on His name, which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." This glorious power operated through Him to whom it had been given by His Father. It was neither more nor less than the power of Sonship. It was this that gave Christ His adoptive strength, which, when imparted to the understanding of the poor bondmen in Adam, who are all their life in fear of death, makes them rejoice with John, saying, "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on us, that we should be called the sons of God. Beloved, now are we the sons of God."

Before this acceptance in Christ not the Gentiles only but the Jews also were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." For it was the promise, not the law, that offered life and inheritance; but what was the promise without the seed to whom it was made?

The position of the Jew has been treated as though it had stood from all time, that is to say, it has not been made plain and prominent that the gist of the Abrahamic promise was its adoptive power through the coming Christ. The promise was 430 years before the law; and the divine prophecy, "I WILL BE WHO I WILL BE," was given to Israel before they reached Sinai's foot. Israel, in their chosen state, were a miniature of the whole family of God when adopted through His own Son. They were a forecast of the Tabernacle of Jehovah with men, standing in contrast with the surrounding world of Adam's sons groaning in their chains, and seeking deliverance from their idol gods, the work of their own hands, who could neither see, nor hear, nor walk. In this living picture we recognise two families, the family of God, and the family of sin, and the entrance of proselytes by circumcision, foreshadowed the grand season of adoption, by the circumcision made without hands in the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the fruit of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead."

The ceremonial of adoption consists in an acknowledgment of our enslaved state, the recognition of Jesus as the God-provided Redeemer, immersion for induction into the name He bears, and steadfast hope of the inheritance defined in the word.

This being accomplished, we are divinely entitled to partake of the emblems of His body and blood, broken and shed in the grand redemptive work, and henceforward are consoled with the peculiar advantages and blessings which our freedom or sonship justly confers. "We have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but we have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ. "We are now, therefore, placed on a level with Him who was born the Heir. "This is the Heir, come, let us kill Him."

We may now briefly consider our new position. What is to be looked for now? In the first place, chastisement. "For whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. The object of this is that we may "be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live." Our heavenly Father does not chastise all in like measure, but in proportion to their disobedience. Let not those, therefore, who are severely tried think too highly of themselves as though they were their Father's special favourites; but rather judge that such treatment is the just consequence of their short comings. Besides this, trial, of various measure, is needful to the purification of character and the consolidation of all virtue.

Upon this subject there is considerable misapprehension. Some, through divers indiscretions, burden and embarrass themselves, and then by pious self-esteem attribute their sufferings to God, while it is only as natural that they should suffer as that they should get wet by jumping into a river; and it would be as rational to regard such a drenching as a special chastisement of God as to so look upon the trouble they, through imprudence, bring upon themselves. The trials of God's children arise from unforeseen results; losses, bereavements, persecution for Christ's sake. "Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them that are exercised thereby."

But we have also the assurance of God's protecting care. "The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him: no good will be withheld from them that walk uprightly: light is sown for the righteous, and gladness of heart for the upright: the Lord shall preserve thee from all evil: He shall preserve thy soul. And that God heareth us and answereth our prayers." "And this is the confidence that

we have in Him, that, if we ask anything according to His will, He heareth us; and if we know that He hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of Him.” These, then are, in brief, the advantages of adoption into the family of God.

But what is all this in comparison of the final result? That which Paul styles “the redemption of our body” is the grand triumph. The healthy and strong may be glad in this prospect, but it is the sick and afflicted, the aged and infirm who yearn in a peculiar manner for this redemption. Those whose crippled limbs, failing breath, dim sight, over-wrought or bewildered mind - these are they who fetch the deep sighs, yea, “groan” as the apostle saith, “within themselves, waiting for the adoption; to wit, the redemption of their body.”

Still, between robust health and deathlessness the chasm is infinitely greater than between health and decrepitude. Who can describe the flash of joy when “in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the dead shall be raised incorruptible? “And this unutterable bliss will be magnified by association. Not only ourselves, but many friends whose companionship we enjoyed, and whom we laid with many tears in the ground, but the grand historic characters of antiquity, the sojourners and pilgrims of the same faith and hope, the first martyrs, and among them all the great Martyr, Jesus, shall we behold. These, like bright groups of stars encircling the moon, or diamond dew sparkling on the grass and herbs, will fill our wondering eyes, and make us feel ashamed of all our past troubles as altogether unworthy to be named in view of our great reward. Let these joyous thoughts arouse our flagging pace. As we near the prize the eye should grow brighter, the fire glow more ardently, so that we may not seem to be expecting that for which we do not strive.

BORN AGAIN.

This expression occurs only four times in the Scriptures, in John and Peter. The puzzle it was to Nicodemus, when it fell from the lips of Jesus, shows that it cannot be taken in a natural sense, and that the ruler did not understand its spiritual meaning. The terms in which all its significance is couched are these: “Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” But those terms must be understood before their significance can be grasped. Popular instruction allots but a scanty need to this strange saying, and dismisses it by reference to a plunge in the waters of baptism, or even the use of several drops, and a sensation of the Holy Ghost in the heart. It deserves, however, a more deliberate enquiry and a more extensive use of our reasoning powers.

It is plain that, whether birth be natural or spiritual there must first be begettal, conception, and gestation; and that unless these processes are correctly carried out abortion or idiocy will ensue. We would not, however, strain the analogy, still we cannot discard all resemblance except at the risk of ruining the divine teaching.

Our utter dependence on God for deliverance from death is seen in nothing with greater clearness than in this subject of spiritual begettal. This figure declares to man his absolute helplessness in the work of his own salvation; that is to say, he cannot take the first step in the matter; though when this step is taken he can work with advantage. What we mean now is shewn in the fact that no one can beget himself; no one can be the author of his own conception and birth. So it is spiritually, and, inasmuch as without these things there can be no offspring, so it is impossible that any man can cause himself to become a child of God.

“Faith cometh by hearing the word of God.” What the womb is to natural seed, so is the ear to the word of God. That word is seed, spiritually speaking, and the Almighty is the sower of it: “of his own will begat he us with the word of Truth.” “When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth not, then cometh the wicked, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart.” “The word of the kingdom proceeds from God; it is not the word of man, and where this has not been sown it can bring forth no fruit; but where it is sown, and nourished in the affections, it “brings forth fruit unto eternal life.” Hence the logical conclusion is that eternal life is the result of the “word of the kingdom.” From this consideration it will be seen at once that success or failure depends, in the first place, solely upon the quality of the seed sown. Bad seed cannot produce good fruit. The first enquiry, therefore, into the saying of Jesus - “Born again” - is an enquiry into the nature of the seed, or “the word of the kingdom.” This phrase “the word of the kingdom” - is a partial definition of the nature of the seed; explaining that the word is concerning a kingdom; or, still using the figure of speech, the seed sown will become a world-wide Theocracy in its harvest time.

This doctrine is as old as the Bible itself. Jesus borrowed it from the old prophets. “The Lord shall be king over all the earth.” Zec. xiv. 9. “I shall give thee (Christ) the nations of the earth for thine

inheritance.” Psal. ii. 8. “The God of heaven shall set up a kingdom.” Dan. ii. 44. “And there was given him (Christ) dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that ALL PEOPLE, NATIONS, and languages should serve Him” (Christ). Dan. vii. 14. And the same prophetic Spirit, speaking to John in the Isle of Patmos, saith, “The kingdoms of THIS WORLD are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever.” Rev. ii. 15.

In view of testimony so plain it is passing strange to see “ministers of the gospel” sowing seed destined to bear fruit “beyond the starry sky;” and stranger still to hear some teaching both the one thing and the other. These are certainly two different seeds: one is “the good seed,” or “word of the kingdom to be set up over all the earth;” the other “tares,” or the word of the old pagan philosophers, not once mentioned by the Prophets, Jesus, or the Apostles. Among the four hundred or more occurrences of the word heaven in the Scriptures, no allusion whatever is made to it as a place of abode in store for man. But instead of being invited there by God, he is told he cannot go. The harvest, therefore, which is certain to follow the sowing of such seed, will be a harvest of disappointment. God has nowhere sowed it, and will not follow it with His blessing.

After the seed has fallen into a “good and honest heart,” it begins, imperceptibly for a while, to develop; till at length the bearer finds himself impelled by these new ideas to corresponding action. This is traceable to the occasion on which he “received seed.” Having followed the counsel of Christ - “Seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness” - he is now induced to consider the meaning of this latter - “his righteousness” - in order that, by the ordinance of baptism, he may give evidence that he has “put on the righteousness of God.” Being taught by the prophets and apostles that Christ is our righteousness, he weighs the facts and needs in connexion with Christ. First, He is God’s own and only begotten Son. Second, He is sent into the world to do His Father’s will - to shew to man the possibility of overcoming sin. Third, He is to be a sufficient sacrifice for the whole world. Fourth, His death must be a voluntary offering in order to be acceptable to God. Fifth, This offering must itself be without spot. Sixth, Having paid the ransom He rises to immortality as the just reward of His obedience. Seventh, He is exalted to priesthood in the presence of God, to mediate on behalf of those who accept His ransom.

These ideas duly elaborated in his own mind, our candidate for immortal honours perceives himself to have developed so far in the knowledge of the gospel as to see his own nakedness and need of covering, so as to be accounted holy in the sight of God, “Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.” The eternal spirit has made known but one mode of investiture. The mystical waters are before him, and his ardent cry is - “See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptised?” The answering voice saith, “If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.” And he saith, “I believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God”

Reflection may suggest the peculiar fitness of the simple rite. Several things are implied. First; Crucifixion; Second, Death; Third, Burial; fourth, Resurrection; Fifth, New life. All these again afford separately matter for thought. Besides, as the ordinance is a figurative, not a real, death; it is seen to be figurative of a washing and clothing also. The intelligent subject of it is washed. He was as scarlet, he is like snow; he was as crimson, he is like wool. He was accounted as filthy; he is esteemed as clean. To the household of God he was a stranger, he is now a son. He was a member of the Body of Adam; he is now a member of the Body of Christ. He had no part in the covenanted inheritance; he is now a king and priest elect, awaiting promotion to power and glory. Having entered morally and doctrinally upon a new life, he now lives by faith on the Son of God who gave Himself for him.

He is nourished from day to day on “that bread which came down from heaven, whereof if a man eat he shall not die in the age.” Every first day he visibly expresses his relation to his new Master by eating and drinking the symbols of His sacrifice, and binding himself to Him by every cord of memory, and is especially careful not to neglect this feast at which this Son and Redeemer is ever present by His own appointed emblems. In his new life he shines as a light in the world. Men behold the correctness of his walk, the wisdom and prudence of his ways: all within the circle of his being are stimulated by his excellent example. He is part of the “salt of the earth,” and through him men are induced to inquire after Christ. He is intellectually and morally “born again,” yea, “born of the Spirit.” “The words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life.” “Of God’s own will ye are begotten by the word of truth.”

“The words I speak are spirit. “Evidently this saying needs explanation. Words themselves are only sounds produced by the passing of breath, or air, over the larynx or organs of the throat, called the vocal chords. We would paraphrase thus: “The words I speak, are” able to transform men into “spirit.” None of the many allusions to spirit in the scripture reveal to us what spirit is. God is spirit, but not knowing what spirit is, we do not know what God is. We cannot find out God by searching. Flesh is known; it has been examined, and its composition declared; but spirit is a mystery still. We know, however, that when applied to flesh it is capable of making it immortal. Jesus became immortal flesh and bone. Though

spirit, He is not a phantom; “for a phantom,” said He, “hath not flesh and bones as ye see Me have.” What He now is all must be, or they cannot enter the kingdom of God; - a sufficient proof, surely, that none are in that kingdom now. Jesus did not tell Nicodemus that he must be disembodied in order to enter the kingdom; but that he must “be born of the spirit;” afterwards shewing that by such birth Nicodemus would become spirit; namely, “that which is born of flesh is flesh; and that which is born of spirit is spirit.”

“The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou nearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the spirit.” Thus our version renders the original of John iii. 8. But this translation of the Greek word *pneuma* by the English word *wind* in this passage does not appear at all satisfactory. The word is the same at the end of the verse as at the beginning; why not have said, therefore, “So is every one that is born of the wind” if *wind* be correct in the first instance? But it is not a fact that “the wind bloweth where it listeth,” or willeth, for it can have no will in the matter; besides, to hear the sound of the wind can be of no spiritual benefit. Let us read it thus:

“The spirit breathes where he wills, and thou hearest the sound thereof but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit.”

The following are Wiclif’s translation, A.D. 1380, and the Rheims translation of 1582 :-

WICLIF:

“The spirit brethith where he wole, thou herist his vois, but thou woost not fro whennes he cometh, ne whider he goith, so is ecche man that is borun of the spirit.”

RHEIMS:

“The spirit breatheth vvhre he vvil, and thou hearest his voice, but thou knowest not whence he commeth and wither he goeth, so is every one that is borne of the Spirit.”

The Eternal Spirit had breathed on Jesus, and Nicodemus heard the sound of His voice. This was the fullest measure of the Spirit or rather Spirit unmeasured, while the same thing in a measured form was heard in the prophets and apostles. None living can explain this mysterious motive power, but even a child may be struck with its results. Here is a mental birth of the Spirit experienced by men in the flesh; but the physical birth will change the flesh itself. Why should incorruptible flesh be thought impossible with God? Is it a greater marvel than the frame-work of the universe? Is it more wonderful than the globe itself, flying noiseless as a soap-bubble through the air? We have seen the one but not the other; there is the difficulty. Nevertheless we possess the testimony of credible men who did see it; the rest remains for faith. Jesus seems to be the only dead man who has been raised to immortality. The world’s future is suspended on this one fact. Were it a moment doubtful we should be like some rushing comet in the trackless sky.

But though unseen, except for forty days, Jesus did more terrible work after He was “born again” than He did before. Indeed while in the flesh He was harmless to the world, but no sooner “in the spirit” than the work of vengeance began. It should seem that this was a foreshadowing of things to occur when those of whom was “the first fruits” shall rise and shake themselves from the dust. There is no thought so startling as that of the rising of the dead! It was the agitation of the disciples, after Jesus had gone up into heaven that maddened the Jews and Romans. Through this His absence was more dangerous than His presence. The first birth was a shock to His enemies, but the second infinitely greater. By murdering Him they had, as it were, hastened the day of His power and brought upon them His vengeance.

“Born again!” was now the new cry of His disciples. Everywhere they shouted, “He is risen from the dead! He is alive! We have seen Him!” This was the death-knell of the Jewish Commonwealth, and the doom of Pagan Rome. This voice went out to the ends of the world. The earth moved, the mountains were shaken, the foundations of the temples were loosened, the doors dropped from their hinges, and the idol images staggered, fell, and were dashed to pieces. He who was risen sat in the heavens guiding the tide of war, and His friends went forth “conquering and to conquer.” The idol deities had prophesied many things, but they had not foretold their own ruin by a man who should be born again. This birth of spirit they knew not of, or denied; now their votaries “heard the sound of his voice,” like the subterranean thunder that goes before the earthquake, but they could not tell whence it was, and whither it went. We have endeavoured to sketch the process, and indicate some of the results which follow from being “born again.”

THE DELUGE,

BY THE LATE JOSEPH H. WOOD.

(Continued from September, page 18)

I am not aware in what condition the fishes of the antediluvian era existed, for there certainly were fishes long before the deluge. Dr. Burnet would fail to account for any, unless they were all caged safely within the shell of the earth. If so, this deluge, which was death and ruin to man and animals, was actually a sort of millennium for the fishes, for previously to this period, they must have been singularly in want of both fresh air and daylight.

This theory is exceedingly useful in pointing out a mode by which all things could be destroyed, and very conveniently disposes of the antediluvian refuse, but it has the misfortune not to agree with the teachings of the Bible, for in the creation God had "divided the land from the water, and called the dry land earth, and the gathering together of waters called he seas."

A Mr. King thinks that the deluge arose from a subterranean fire, which burst out underneath the sea, and caused the water to be raised from its bed. However warily, then, antediluvians had previously escaped the troubles of life, and passed smoothly on amidst its changing circumstances, by this theory it appears that at last they really did get into "hot water."

There are others who think that the centre of the earth's gravity was removed, and that the waters not being restrained within the limits of the ocean's bed left their abode for twelve months in order to work the world's destruction. The whole waters of the ocean in one mighty wave crested with thunder took its solemn journey round the world, and overwhelming its several parts in succession.

Another opinion is, that it was the shock of a comet that occasioned the deluge, the originator of this supra-biblical theory not knowing that a comet is about as substantial a thing as vapour. It is quite as likely that the flap of a dove's wing, or a whiff of smoke from Noah's tobacco pipe, should have produced it, as that the feathery tail of a body, so attenuated and gaseous as a comet is proved to be, should be the means of causing so serious a disaster. If miracles must be resorted to, in order to account for the flood, this is certainly one of the most wonderful that could be invented. For there must have been miracles in abundance to meet the notions of these comet fanciers.

One of the most common opinions, and one maintained by some recent commentators, is a theory invented by Dr. Woodward. This divine believed that the waters prevailed over the whole earth, and that these abundant waters completely dissolved the solid earth into a pulpy mass. It appears we find him contending, "that the whole terrestrial substance was amalgamated with the waters, after which, the different materials of its composition settled in beds or strata, according to their respective gravities." If this theory is correct, we should naturally expect to find the most weighty substances nearest the centre, and the lighter ones nearer the surface, but we are unable by this theory to explain how the light and fibrous coral, as well as portions of fossilized wood, are found in the lowest fossiliferous rocks, while the flint of the chalk, and the boulders of the drift are so near the surface. A piece of timber, one would think, had as great a right to float, as a flint stone. This theory fails to explain these difficulties.

If the deluge really formed the earth into this puddle, it should, I imagine, have deposited it evenly all round, for water is not often in the habit of depositing sediments quite so large as mountains, and we are at a loss, on this theory, to ascertain whence they came. If all bodies sank according to their gravities, we should expect them to appear in real hills all round the world, besides, as water does not often deposit sediment above its own surface, I do not exactly perceive why there is not a deluge up to the present day, for the sediment would surely all go down towards the centre. Whence then came the dry land? And if the land was also the result of a sediment, how was it that the ark found so firm a resting place as Ararat, and the dove was able to pluck an olive leaf to bring to Noah in the ark?

This opinion reminds me of an incident which, it is said, occurred about a century ago. A venerable clergyman was travelling over the fens of Lincolnshire, when he overtook on his lonely way a person who was very anxiously and perseveringly boring the earth with a pole. On enquiring the reason for this strange procedure, the earnest man informed his reverence that he had been riding on horseback, but his horse had sunk from beneath him into the fen, and he was feeling for him. If the deluge really did produce this mud world of Dr. Woodward's, perhaps this incident is true, and these fens may possibly be the last trace of his puddle.

The prevailing opinion with reference to the flood is, that it extended over the whole earth, not only to the abodes of the entire human family, but above every hill in lands that mankind did not inhabit. There

are, however, some eminent and learned men who contend that the flood was not universal with regard to the earth, but that it was universal with regard to mankind.

In this hasty glance at the various opinions that have been entertained, we cannot avoid noting one fact in which all concur, that the whole human race was destroyed except those who were saved in the ark. Among them, however, we perceive a class who are not satisfied with the simple narrative of the Scriptures, but who desire to make the accompanying miracles so grand, and numerous, that they become, as we have already seen, absolutely ridiculous, and must have a tendency with some of begetting disbelief in the verities of holy writ, while in realists it is not God's word that is denied, but man's folly in its interpretation.

But we must now enquire into the extent of the deluge. The Bible is the only source of appeal in this greatly controverted question. If it distinctly affirms that the waters covered the whole earth round to its hill tops, there is an end at once to all diversity of opinion, but if it does not make this affirmation, but implies the contrary, and reasonable argument will agree with, and be corroborated by the Divine testimony, then we have ground on which to hold an opposite opinion.

It will be necessary, first of all, to explain a few of the arguments which have been advanced in favour of the universality of the deluge, in order that we may ascertain whether there be any weighty reasons for defending and maintaining that opinion.

The principal argument which is produced in favour of the universal inundation, is the universal prevalence of the tradition relating to the deluge. That as the tradition exists in every part of the world, so must also the flood which it describes have existed there also. It does not follow, however, that because the tradition is universal, that the flood must have been universal too. In this argument it seems to have been forgotten that all these traditions refer to, and were brought in evidence of one event. It is admitted that Noah and his family were the only persons saved from the flood. Of necessity, therefore, no human testimony can be borne of its existence, anywhere except around the ark. It is admitted that all who are living in the world at the present day, are descendants from the sons of Noah. As the families of our species spread after the deluge, they would carry with them the tradition of the earth's destruction, as related by their fathers, to the remotest corners of the earth. But this is no proof whatever that it extended to the locality in which they now reside. The only object gained by this fact, is in proof of the whole human race being submerged, except those in the ark, and that all the race are descended from one parentage.

They have another argument, which possesses no greater pretensions to logic than the former. There have been discovered at different times in various parts of the globe, monuments, and inscriptions in rock, which bear upon them evidence of such antiquity that they were once supposed to have existed previous to the deluge. It has been found by diligent and persevering research that they are of greatly more recent date than that event. The Chinese, also, have long boasted of their national antiquity. It is so old that some of their names have grown four inches long. They enumerate a long list of dynasties, each of which continued for thousands of years. The truth of this antiquity bears a strong resemblance to the tale of an old Welsh nobleman, who was able to trace his fathers far into the gray and dreamy past, and prided himself greatly on the long list of ancestry which he possessed. Upon this valued and time-honoured document, and somewhere about half-way down, there was written in the margin, "About this time the world was created." By the diligent research of persons conversant with the Chinese language, it has been proved that the assertions respecting their great antiquity are entirely fabulous. They cannot trace the existence of their nation at all prior to about 3000 years after the deluge, and, apart from the Bible, authentic history does not extend further back than about 800 or 1000 years B.C.

So far, therefore, as at present discovered, there is no nation or memorial, no workmanship of men's hands, no trace indeed of man's existence at a period previous to the times of Noah.

Upon this fact it has been contended that the deluge was geographically universal, because some remains of the imperishable productions of human skill by the antediluvian races, would be discovered if the flood had not destroyed them. Negative argument is worth but little. It should first be proved that these monuments existed at all. It moreover presupposes the universal diffusion of the race, an event which it is impossible to prove. It is admitted on all hands, that the whole human race were destroyed, except the eight souls in the ark. If man, therefore, had erected buildings for his convenience, the flood reaching wherever he or his works existed, they all would be destroyed - the traces of his handiwork it will be hopeless to search for.

Being satisfied of the force of these arguments we will proceed to examine a third.

There are some who adopt a more ingenious course than the preceding, and set out by attempting to prove that the earth was as populous at the time of the deluge as at the present day.

This is a position there is no danger of seeing proved, but against so wild a speculation we may place a sober argument. We have already attempted to show, and the remark has force on this question, that excess in sin has a tendency to reduce, by disease and decay, rather than increase the population of a nation. The sins of the antediluvians were of a nature that would have a tendency to exert this influence.

Although the antediluvians lived, in most recorded instances, to such extreme and venerable ages, we have no proof that their families were in proportion to their ages, compared with the age and increase of the present population. The inference in the Bible would lead us to the contrary opinion, for we find in almost every case that the father was but little short of a century old when his firstborn son is mentioned. If we take Noah as an instance, although he was good and virtuous yet at six hundred years old he had only three sons, for there were but eight persons saved in the ark.

Besides, if Noah preached to, and warned, these antediluvians, they could not have lived the wide world over, or he would have been sadly tired of his errand, and would have had but little opportunity for superintending the construction of the ark.

The universal terms in which the event is recorded in the inspired volume is urged as a sufficient reason, apart from argument, for believing in the universality of the deluge. Such passages as these are referred to:- "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth;" "All the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered.

This argument it is both necessary and important that we should fairly consider.

The word translated "Earth," very frequently signifies in the Bible a limited extent of country, and is, in that sense, synonymous with "land," and not the globe of the earth geographically speaking.

Again, the universal expression, "All the earth," is used also very commonly, both in the Old and New Testament, to signify only a very limited portion, and not the entire globe. A few examples will the better explain this hyperbolic mode of biblical expression: "And the famine was sore over all the face of the earth, and all countries came to Egypt to buy corn." "All the earth sought to Solomon to hear his wisdom." "This day will I begin to put the fear of thee and the dread of thee upon the nations that are under the whole heaven." By these nations under the whole heaven, however, are evidently meant the tribes inhabiting Palestine and its eastern border. "Then king Darius wrote unto all people, nations, and languages that dwell in all the earth:" (which implies that he was either a very ready scribe, or his earth was not a very extensive one) and we find that all the earth only extended to the dominions of his kingdom.

From the parallel there is between the forms of expression used in these as well as many other passages, and the terms in which, the narrative of the deluge is expressed, we have no ground to affirm the literal universality of the flood, and have no right to do so on such slender evidence.

It has been urged that there would have been no necessity for placing birds in the ark, if the deluge were not universal. A writer sarcastically enquires, "Why the birds did not fly over the low hills and escape? They seem to have had little instinct in those days." Instinct would never lead them to fly from the locality they inhabited, and the writer is greatly mistaken if he supposes they would take to a long and laborious flight in a drenching rain. The birds would no more have been saved by instinct than the animals, unless they had taken their place in the ark.

There are some species of birds so limited in their range that if only a small district was submerged the whole species would become extinct. For instance the celebrated birds of Paradise are confined to a small territory, embracing New Guinea and a few contiguous islands. The great eagle is confined to the Alps, and the condor is said never to leave the Andes. Humming birds are entirely confined to the Western hemisphere, and some species are limited by one solitary island, and the common grouse is found nowhere out of Great Britain. The submergence therefore, of any of these localities would be a means of annihilating the species it contained

Again. It has been urged that "if the flood was only local, the birds would speedily replenish the inundated land as soon as the waters had subsided." If so, the habits of birds must have greatly altered in order to lead them to such an adventure. How is it that birds which are common in France and Holland do not visit us otherwise than as stragglers? Why do they not replenish this country with their species? How is it that the grouse is not found out of Great Britain? Why are not the golden and white tailed eagle seen more frequently in England, while they breed in Scotland, and the former around the Lakes of Killarney? But this bird, even in Scotland, has not been known again to breed in those districts from which it has once been exterminated.

The capercaillie is a British bird, but became entirely extinct in this country, although it existed on the coast of Norway. The late Sir Thomas Powell Buxton, at considerable expense and trouble, reintroduced these birds into Britain, and presented them to the Marquis of Breadalbane, and instead of

populating the surrounding districts, Hugh Miller informs us that these birds are still confined to the Breadalbane woods.

There are still persons who contend, in spite of its many absurdities, that the aqueous rocks, and the organic remains which they contain, are proofs of the deluge.

If the whole strata of the world were deposited during the deluge we should necessarily expect to find them a promiscuous and confused deposit; besides the animal and vegetable remains would also be distributed without regard to order or species; but no confusion prevails in the strata of earth (except where contorted by volcanic forces) the arrangement of each stratum is orderly and unique. It, moreover, entombs some animal or vegetable organism peculiar to itself. For instance, the *Cephalaspis* is entirely confined to the old red sandstone, and the whole genera of those peculiar Crustaceans, the *Trilobites*, the *Asifibus*, and *Calymene* are confined exclusively to the upper Silurian rocks. These genera, including several species, besides vast multitudes of others, had ceased altogether before the commencement of the carboniferous deposits. Certain reptiles, again, are only found in the cretaceous formation, and others are equally restricted to particular rocks. If the flood had deposited them all in 150 days, we certainly should expect to find a less systematic arrangement. Why is not the *Mososaurus* and *Ignanodon* of the Welden and the chalk found also in the Devonian or Permian systems, for, in all conscience, they were weighty enough to sink to the bottom? And why not the bright-eyed *Trilobites*, with their scaly comrades of the lower rocks, found in more superficial deposits, for they are the very animals we would expect to be uppermost, being able to swim, while the former were not blessed with that power in any great degree? No such discovery, however, has hitherto occurred.

Those who contend on this geological argument also forget one very important matter. If the deluge had deposited these animal remains in the rocks we should, of course, conclude that they had their representatives safely preserved within the ark, which would repopulate the earth with other species. The fact is unfortunate for the theory. Nearly all the organisms that are discovered in the strata of the globe are the remains of totally extinct species and such, many of them, as could not exist in the present condition of the globe. These debaters appear not to be aware that the *Plesiosaurus* and *Denotherium* are no longer tenants of the earth. The Dean of York is, however, ready with a suggestion to explain this difficulty. "He thinks that the *Megatherium* *Ichthyosaurus*, and other animals have become extinct because they would not make up their minds soon enough, and found the door of the ark shut when they arrived, so they perished with the rest of the wicked.

It is, moreover, on the other side of the question, fatal to this opinion, that none of the existing animals are found in a fossil state. If man was universally diffused, why have not human fossils been discovered, or the more durable marks of human handicraft; surely they would have been if all these rocks had resulted from the flood of Noah.

It is contended that although the whole strata may not be referable to the flood; yet, there are superficial beds of clay and gravel called "drift," which bear evidence of the universality of the deluge. This, however, stands on no better foundation, if examined, than the former.

There is yet another, which would be beneath contempt did it not proceed from a recent expositor, and that his book is intended for Sunday-school teachers. I refer to Dr. Campbell's *Expository Bible*. He says, "Inhabitants of all climes commingled; animals, natives of America, have been found buried in India." No reason is given to account for their conveyance from America to India. A very perilous voyage, one would think, for either human or brute, and to arrive in such a satisfactory state of preservation that they could be proved to have travelled from America, during the deluge, is certainly very marvellous. Why these inhabitants of all climes, and "natives of America" especially, all happened to float until they came to India, does not appear. If the current was so rapid as to convey, in a few months, several bodies from America to India, it does appear strange that the ark did not get into one of these currents and be carried to the summit of the Andes or the Rocky Mountains. He further states that shells and skeletons of fishes are now found on the tops of the highest mountains in the world. The writer fails to inform us whether these are recent or extinct shells; and if recent are they bivalves or univalves, because the former cannot swim, and but few of the latter have any extensive locomotion. It will scarcely be affirmed that the bivalve from the deep ocean or the sea-shore, whose greatest powers of locomotion would perhaps be but a few feet in a day would be able to reach, in the quantities in which Dr. CAMPBELL would lead us to expect they are found, in the short space of 150 days, the tops of the highest mountains in the world. But to estimate this last statement at its true value, we must add, that no human foot has ever yet reached the tops of the highest mountains in the world, and never will, so that how these shells were found, on which Dr Campbell founds his argument remains somewhat puzzling.

There is not nearly so much danger in young people being misled, as to divine truth, by what this commentator calls "a godless geology," as from the perversion of truth and misstatement of fact, on which he appears in this passage so truly to indulge.

These are the strongest arguments which have been hitherto advanced to prove that the deluge really was universal. It will be noticed that they are entirely unsatisfactory as arguments; indeed, the feeble support which they render to the theory only shows how untenable is the position on which the advocates of the universal deluge stand. We will now briefly glance at another class of facts, which may be considered to favour a local inundation, - and on this part of the subject time will not allow me to give you more than a mere fragmentary outline.

In the first place there is a number of difficulties presented which are entirely dispensed with in supposing a limited deluge.

The first of these is the vast amount of water which would be necessary for the covering of the highest mountains of the world 22 feet above their summit.

The rain which fell from the clouds could exert but little effect over the entire world in producing any considerable depth of water, under the existing laws which regulate it. The atmosphere could not have retained moisture to the extent required. During the rainy season of the wettest countries in the world 150 inches is the greatest amount of rain precipitated in 41 days; and the average annual fall of rain for the whole world is but about 5 feet. It must not be forgotten that before this rain falls it has to be taken from the earth; and this process of evaporation is continual. It is evident therefore that water produced from rain would not rise so high as the tops of the highest mountains in 40 days, because it would find its level again in the ocean from which it had been originally evaporated.

This amount of water would not be caused by the ocean, for there would require eight or nine times the amount of water existing in the world to cover the tops of the highest mountains. If we suppose the whole ocean beds of the round world to be elevated to a level with the land, still the mountains would stand half their height above the water. The miracles, indeed, necessary to obtain the water for a universal deluge, are so stupendous and numerous, that they would surely have been recorded in the sacred book, if they had ever been performed.

Another important difficulty is the dimensions of the ark.

Many have been the calculations entered into by divines, in order to get every species of animal into the ark. In some instances they may have succeeded to their own satisfaction, but in such cases a very low estimate has been taken of the distinct species which the world contains. The animals known a few centuries ago were but few in comparison with the number at present described. The calculations which enabled commentators to get pairs of all the animals of the world into the ark, were based upon the supposition that the number of species could be reduced to three or four hundred, which would be reckoned in pairs. At the present day, there are known upwards of 1,500 animals, which must have gone into the ark in pairs, besides 166 clean beasts, which would be by sevens, making nearly 1,200 more. There are 675 reptiles in pairs besides fifteen others of doubtful admission. There are also about 6,300 species of birds which would go into the ark by sevens making 44,000 birds alone. The insect world would require protection and even those at present discovered, amount to about 550,000 which would require some considerable space. With this long catalogue of living things it would be difficult to dispose them in the dimensions of the ark, to say nothing of the provisions they would require. In this age of traffic we might be disposed to make our computations on our present mode of commercial conveyance; even were we to take this very unjust plan, we should find the space vastly too small for the number of occupants.

We have no right to assume that these animals were packed like herrings in a barrel, but we have a right to expect that the merciful Being who directed them to the ark for preservation, would allow them that liberty which their habits and comfort demanded.

It has been argued that if the ark was not large enough for all the animals of the world, it was in the power of Omnipotence to compress them into a sufficiently small compass - by reducing their size, and thus enabling them all to gain admission. To start such a supposition, implies that the Allwise was not aware what dimensions would be necessary, or the ark might have been made larger. It is bordering upon profanity to make such an implication.

If this compressing plan had been adopted, one would think that to Noah, at any rate, a little additional contraction would have been more satisfactory, as they might then have all been put within a nut-shell, and would thus have saved all the time and toil of building so immense a vessel for their accommodation.

Another important obstacle is the distribution of animals upon the earth.

It is a fact well known that certain animals are restricted within very narrow limits. The tropical animals do not venture into the temperate zone, and those of northern latitudes would find it equally fatal if they ventured into the equatorial regions.

The royal tiger is exclusively confined to the jungles of Asia. The giraffe is of very limited African range, and each species of elephant is respectively restricted to Asia and Africa. Glance across the Atlantic. Not one of these animals are found on the continents of the new world. The bison of the north, the puma and jaguar of the south, are each confined to its particular locality. Again, if we visit Australia, another and completely different class of animals are found - the great kangaroo, and the ursine opossum, as well as its peculiar birds, the emu and cassowary, with several other animals, altogether peculiar to the country.

These facts show us the impossibility, without miraculous intervention to so collect from the uttermost parts of the earth the representatives of every species, in order to preserve them in the ark. That they would not have undertaken such an adventure by their own instinct is proved by their present habits. These facts necessitate the belief that the diversity of animated creation in the new world, on the one side, and from the extreme New Holland, on the other, found their way by some mysterious path across the wide oceans and deserts that intervened from a particular spot in Asia, where the ark rested, to the locality. Animals were wise navigators in those old times; such exploits as they must have performed would far outrival the sagacious deeds of our modern explorers of a north-west passage. Perhaps these animals discovered a submarine passage.

By what instinctive impulses would they be led to a climate suited to their nature and constitution? Their ordinary powers of locomotion must have been improved, or the lifetime of a single pair of animals would have failed before they reached the necessary distance.

As all other animals but those within the ark would be destroyed, all existing animals must have emanated from a common centre. If it be so, how is it that one species is not more commonly distributed? It is strange that these animals, travelling from Asia Minor to New Holland, should not leave so much as a pair of their progeny behind them, which could have populated Asia with the species; and that the South African sloth should not have left traces of its journey, by the descendants inhabiting the forests of Africa, of the steppes of Siberia.

The full consideration of this subject, presents the greatest absurdities and difficulties, which it is impossible to surmount. If we suppose the flood to have been limited, then these difficulties disappear, and the events become explicable.

If the sea had completely overflowed the land, the inhabitants of the fresh water would have died. These fresh-water fish of inland lakes, and of rivers, it will be readily seen, could not originate from one centre. Indeed, the centres of ichthyic creation must have been almost as numerous as the locality which they inhabit.

It would appear that if the whole world was destroyed by water, there must have been a re-creation at various centres on the earth's surface, since that event, especially of the fresh-water fishes. It does not in any way accord with the sacred writings to admit a new creation of animals, for we must expect, that, as the first creation is so plainly recorded, this second would also be equally inscribed in its pages. If there had been a new creation, then was there no necessity for preserving pairs of every living creature in the vessel with Noah?

The scripture difficulty seems to me to be the least easily of all to be reconciled with the universal overflow to the tops of the highest mountains.

If I, or any other person, were to affirm that the ark rested on Mount Everest, or any other mountain, which shall hereafter be found the highest in the world, it would with true reason be denied, because the bible distinctly states that it rested on the mountains of Ararat. The highest summit of the mountains of Armenia, is about 17,000 feet. Let us suppose - to give all possible liberty - that the ark rested on this mountain, and the bible informs us that this event occurred in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month; at that time, however, all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered, for we are further informed, that it was not until the tenth month, on the first day of the month, that the tops of the mountains were seen. As all the mountains were below the water's level when the ark grounded, say at a height of 17,000 feet, we require that law of hydrostatics explaining what caused it to cover those mountains, which rise to 29,000 or 30,000 feet. From this difficulty there is no escape, unless it be proved that the Himalayas and the Andes were not in existence at the deluge, or that the Ararat of scripture is at the north of India.

There are other difficulties which must be entirely omitted.

The corroborative evidence of a limited deluge, furnished by geographical and other facts, I have time only very rapidly to mention.

The greater portion of Palestine, and a wide tract of country extending towards the Caspian Sea, is considerably below the level of the Mediterranean, so that it would require no very great effort of human art, completely to overflow that land with water.

The oscillation in the level of land is also an additional argument.

The coasts of Norway and Sweden experience a gradual but regular rise and depression. The sea-port of St. Enval, which was in existence in the west of Europe during the last century, is now permanently depressed beneath the waves of the Atlantic. The coast of France also is subject to regular depression. The light-house, built in the time of Caligula, which was standing in the fifteenth century, but which is swept away, and the spot on which it stood buried beneath the waves, as well as the submerged forests of Normandy, are ample proofs.

Besides, the attenuating rise and fall of the waters in the Caspian sea, the recent indications of volcanic agency in that district, as well as other territory of that locality, now permanently depressed beneath the sea, appear to favour a local deluge.

We can conceive how by these natural occurrences, which are continually in operation, a flood of very considerable and yet of limited extent might be produced. If we imagine that this gradual sinking continues until the margin of the district has reached below the level of the sea, the inflow of the water covering at last all the high hills in this vast basin, and this area, in all likelihood, would be vastly more extensive than the limitation of human vision, expressed in the term "under the whole heaven."

It is not the bible, but man's interpretation that has enforced the necessity for believing in a universal deluge. The event is narrated, not from a point of divine observation, but as seen by a human witness. The amount of the deluge is exactly such as would be expected to result from human testimony. It is manifest that, so far as human eye could discern the waters were universal; all the hills, to the verge of the utmost horizon were covered – nothing, indeed, would be visible but a wide waste of waters.

There is, moreover, a manifest caution of expression in these passages of the bible, which relate to natural science, and which is one of the most convincing proofs of the divine authorship of the scriptures. If man had been its unguided author, there would, no doubt, have been some positive assertions which recent discoveries would contradict. In the confession and catechism of the Westminster divines, for instance, language is used in reference to the creation, as was then supposed in accordance with the scriptures, which cannot in any way harmonize with the discoveries in science, while these same facts remarkably accord with the scripture text. As uninspired men they could not make provision for a stage of knowledge not then reached.

Many have been the opposers of the inspired volume, and science has even been libellously enumerated among its suspected foes. But nature - God's own work in the hand of its explorers - instead of raising doubts and questions of its heavenly origin, becomes the firm defender of God's blessed word, confirming it by facts, unfolding many a hidden beauty, and releasing many a difficulty from the stern grasp of superstition. As the connection between science and the bible becomes better understood, more of its mysteries will doubtless be unveiled. Science, which holds no second rank with its numerous and trusty comrades in this godly strife, become the brave defenders of this holy book, and soon shall silence all its loud embattled foes :-

Who, stern in hate, oppose
God's holy word?
One for His truth they stand
Strong in His own right hand,
Firm as a martyr band,
God shield His word.

Onward shall be its course,
Despite of fraud or force,
God is before.
His word ere long shall run,
Free as the noon-day sun;
His purpose must be done,
God bless His word.

THE GLORIFICATION OF THE CHRIST, **(Continued from July, page 16)**

The passage in Hebrews ix. 12, "neither with the blood of goats and calves, but with His own blood He entered once into the holy place," is the expression of the final truth in relation to the Christ's exaltation to the Divine nature (the spiritual Holy of Holies), - the holy place of the Temple being the intermediary, - for Jesus in this last holy place, as the judgment-seat of the Deity, did enter there into the spiritual holy place, Heaven itself, the secret place of the Tabernacle of the Most High with his own blood, when His mortality was swallowed up of life, in His ascension to the Father. When He gave His message to the women, He had not ascended, but He intimated that this would be accomplished before He should see His disciples again. Now this ascension was not a transportation as to locality, but as to personality, from earthly to Heavenly, from mortality to immortality, from corruptible flesh to incorruptible spirit, and it was effected in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, before the judgment-seat of God in Israel, as the only place on earth which the Deity had set apart for the manifestation of judgment and mercy. The rent veil permitted the approach of the Christ to the mercy-seat, inasmuch as it testified the closing of the Mosaic priesthood as a type of good things to come, and the glorification of the Christ there and spiritual offerings was the inauguration of another order of priesthood the Melchisedec, of which the Christ was to be the head. The swallowing-up of his living blood in living spirit, was the donning of the priestly garments pertaining to that order, which fitted Him for the service within the Veil, the true sanctuary of the Deity. The service of priestly intercessions was not made manifest until He was taken up into Heaven at the close of His sojourn on earth, and now at the right hand of the Father He liveth to the age to make intercession for Jehovah's people, as the Great High Priest of their profession. Hence the Holy place into which the Lord Jesus entered was, in its consummated sense, the Divine Nature, and He passed into this with His own blood and became thus allying sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God, and in this Divine Nature He is always in the presence of God for us, as our Advocate and Mediator, and channel of blessing, and a perpetual sacrifice, able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God by Him. He is our Exemplar in the process by which the Sons of God in weakness become the Sons of God in power, and in his perfection of spirit we perceive the peculiar significance of Paul's antitypical holy place, "the Tabernacle which the Lord pitched," the Heaven itself, the presence of God, and the drift of His argument bears out this spiritual realisation, and indeed requires its comprehension to compass the hidden wisdom of the doctrine He is inculcating for faith and hope. In this arrangement of type and antitype, the Temple made with hands is not substituted for the true Tabernacle, but merely becomes a way of approach to the other, in accordance with the requirements of the law of the Lord Jesus' responsibility, the law of works as well as the law of faith which was included in the first, that in fulfilling all righteousness according to that law, He might become the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth.

The Lord could not have continued His instructions in the flesh to His disciples after His resurrection without rendering void the word of the truth spoken by Himself. At His crucifixion the Lord had finished His work in flesh. "It is finished," was His conclusive testimony on this point, and therefore He could not, until He was approved in that He feared and God gave Him glory, undertake any further work in connection with the Great Salvation. The Gospels in their collation shew the character of the Lord's instructions to His disciples concerning His sufferings death resurrection, and glory, and it was because of their forgetfulness of the words He spoke to them when He was yet with them in the flesh, that He reproves them in spirit as slow of heart to believe all that the prophets had written, and by His spirit power of exposition caused their hearts to burn within them; a spirit power, be it remembered, that must have arisen from spirit life in the fulness of the Godhead, and not of supernatural volition acting on the natural man; for here He was not speaking to them as the prophet like unto Moses, but as the Lord and the Christ, having all power in Heaven and in earth to perfect man's redemption, as a man speaketh to his friend. The Pentecostal effusion of spirit powers has been regarded by some writers to be the evidence of our Lord's glorification after His assumption to Heaven in mortal flesh for judgment and reward, but there is no congruity between the bestowal of spirit gifts and the time of change to spirit nature; and besides, the fact is, that the promise of the Father did not take effect immediately on our Lord's assumption. Acts ii. 1, specifies an interval - "but when the day of Pentecost was fully come" - and this destroys the argument for the forty days' lapse before perfection. The affirmation, then, that the forty days lapse from resurrection to glorification is the true unvarnished account, in contradiction of the spirit revelation of the third day glorification, is a misapprehension of the letter of the Word. It is a simple assertion against the reason of the truth.

The assumption to Heaven, and the ascension to the Divine Nature, are two distinct things, which have relation to two distinct periods of time, the latter at the commencement, and the former at the close, of His 40 days' sojourn on earth after His Resurrection; and the analogy is preserved in the judgment and glorification of the saints, at the beginning of the 40 years of written judgments (a day for a year) on the nations, which must succeed the judgment of the House and its glorification, for the glorified House, or Body of the Christ, are the instrumentalities for the execution of the judgments; and during this period of hidden glory they are indoctrinated with all necessary details for the preaching of the Aeonian Gospel, and then as the mystical Christ they ascend to the heavens of the Son's rule and dominion, and sit with Him on His throne, and shine forth as the Sun in the kingdom of the Father.

It is impossible to overlook these remarkable correspondences in the development of the personal and mystical Christ, and the absolute necessity of the raising up into the Divine Nature of the Lord's Christ on the third day, to fulfil them in spirit and in truth. The presumption that glorification on resurrection gives no time for the Judgment, is a groundless reflection on the ability of the Deity to will and to do of His own good pleasure. "Hath he spoken, and will He not do it, whether it be concerning a nation, or a man only." Why the Lord Jesus, in the exercise of the attributes of the Divine Nature, should not be able to judge the quick and the dead in an hour, or in three days, equally as in 40 years, is inexplicable, seeing that with the Lord one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day, and Paul in spirit declares, "We shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye" "The separation of the congregation before the Judgment-seat to the right hand and to the left, may be effected in an equally short space of time, and the acceptance and condemnation follow immediately.

The parabolic representation of the recompenses of reward for well-doing and disobedience would appear to be the corollary of the division of the sheep from the goats, without any pause in the Divine procedure; and it is worthy of remark, that every prophecy of Scripture has had an immediate fulfilment at the expiration of the appointed times of sufferance. The Israelites went out of Egypt the selfsame day. They entered into the Holy Land the selfsame day. The Babylonish Captivity ended the selfsame day; and so on. The ascension to the Divine Nature, upon judgment in flesh and blood, cannot be an imaginary ascension, and surely does not exclude such a judgment in regard to the Lord Jesus, nay, it establishes it rather, and makes it a precedent condition of the blessing, life for evermore, while in respect both of the judgment and ascension, the man does not change his earthly locality. If Adam had been permitted to eat of the tree of life, he would have lived for ever, by an instantaneous change, or translation, into the Divine Nature, and would have passed from the tree an incorruptible and glorious being, "A son of God in power." "The righteous shall be recompensed on the earth, much more the wicked and the sinner." Prov. xi. The second Adam wrought a perfect work in righteousness, and received a full reward on the earth to which he was related, and in the holy place where the manifestations of Deity were alone revealed in Israel for judgment and mercy, and He is the type of His brethren in all things, and the prototype as to the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Wherefore should the Son go to heaven to stand in the presence of God, as a necessity of His judgment and glorification? Are we not as much in His presence on the earth? "Do not I fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord." "In thine we live, and move, and have our being." "Whither can I go from thy presence, whither can I flee from thy spirit," etc., but the assumption of the Son as a mortal man, to the presence of the Father in the glory of His heaven of heavens, is against the letter and spirit of the Word, which declares, "Whom no man hath seen, nor can see," "No man hath seen God at any time, the Only Son, who is in the bosom of the Father (as the Lord the Spirit), He hath declared Him." This is conclusive as a part of the doctrine according to godliness, and any position, which invalidates this emphatic testimony cannot be sustained for a moment in the light of these Scriptures. The fact of many being recorded in the Word of the truth, to have been carried away by spirit power from place to place, does not affect the question, because in all these cases they never passed out of the earth's atmospheric influence, and we have instances in history of mighty rushing winds, or hurricanes, lifting men up over long spaces, without their being able to resist the energy, and bringing them to the earth again safe and sound. Our Lord walked on the waters of the sea of Tiberius by reason of the spirit without measure by which he was invested and which could control all things according to the will of God; and Peter, in the excitement of a strong faith that Jesus would uphold Him and which He vouchsafed to do, so long as he was not afraid with any amazement, as an outward influence, while they both nevertheless lived, and moved, and had their being under the physical laws of Adamic existence; but the notion of carrying flesh and blood through the regions of space, in a living state, to look without destruction on the unveiled Majesty of the Deity, is, in the judgment of the Word itself, an impossibility, for thus saith the Lord, "No man can see me, and live." A calm and enlarged reflection on all the collateral issues, must dismiss, as an unscriptural conclusion, the 40 days' existence before judgment of our Lord Jesus after His resurrection,

and that the process and period of His glorification is coincident with the day of His resurrection, and is the vindication and the sure foundation of the doctrine of Aeonian judgment of flesh and blood, for the development of its resurrectional perfection. (To be continued.)

[The careful perusal of this paper fails to prove to our mind, quite as decidedly as the preceding on the same subject, that the writer has any Scripture warrant for the positions referred to in our last foot note, and we are not sorry to see that he intends to end the matter in his next article. - EDITOR.]

A SPIRITUAL SALE.

“What a scandal, to take up a newspaper and find whole columns devoted to the advertisements of sale of livings; and to see the tone and language of some of the advertisements themselves!” - Arch. of Canterbury’s Address, September 2, 1869.

Going, going, going!
I’m going to tell you a tale,
Stranger than any you ever could learn
From spirits that rap or tables that turn,
Of a very remarkable sale.

Going, going, going!
No need very far to go.
Buy the Ecclesiastical Gazette,
Where “Spiritual” goods and chattels are set,
The zeal of unbeneficed clerics to whet,
Like “temporals” all of a row.

Going, going, going!
The articles selling here
Are of Church Preferment some rare tit-bits,
And Simon Magus himself he sits
Enthroned as auctioneer.

Going, going, going!
(Number three hundred and eight)
“The present incumbent is eighty-two;”
Let’s hope that he’s ailing and feeble too,
But youthful apostles, in any case you
Can’t have very long to wait.

Going, going, going!
Perchance it may help him on,
When he hears the chink of the purchaser’s gold,
And knows his poor frail life is sold -
We may trust very soon this disciple old
Will be going, going, gone.’

Going, going, going!
Number one is, of course, the best.
Walled gardens well stocked and pleasure-grounds,”
I’m free to confess, Mr. Bagster, it sounds
Like an “everlasting rest.”

Going, going, going!
George Robins, this smacks of you -
“Magnificent views,” and “a house replete
With every convenience” the buyer may
meet,
Who goes in for number two?

Going, going, going!
Reflect before you refuse.
The “views” described with cool
effrontery
Are simply views across the country,
And not “religious views.”

Going, going, going!
Particulars may be seen,
Though “confidentially” names must lurk
In this interesting spiritual work,
Simon Magus - his Magazine.

Going, going, gone!
(three hundred and twenty-five)
“A lawn and paddock and pond of fish”
If fishes, not “men,” the rector may wish
To “cure,” for a future dainty dish,
It’s here he can “catch ‘em alive.”

Going, going, going!
Here’s a buyer “declining pews”
It’s plain his sermons don’t draw renters
Another rather likes Dissenters -
“Holds Evangelical views.”

Going, going, going!
The sooner it’s going and gone,
The sooner we call ourselves Mormon or
Turk
The better “if this is Christian work,”
Or Christian “goings” on!

From Punch.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

To the Editor of the “Christadelphian Lamp” MR ROBERTS AND THE “DOWIEITES”

In the Christadelphian for August I observe an editorial article animadverting on your recent visit to Edinburgh, and your being in the company of certain professed baptised believers of the Gospel of the Kingdom there. These, not being orthodox Birmingham disciples, the editor is pleased to nickname Dowieites. As I happen to be one of these, and am even named in the said article, and as I take exception to certain of the editor's statements regarding them, I feel desirous to reply. But as it is not in accordance with his principles to permit replies when opposed to his own ideas, I respectfully request to make a few observations in the Christadelphian Lamp on the article referred to. In doing so I shall confine myself to statements regarding myself and the parties mentioned.

And first, I would refer to the editor's warning that by allowing you to take us to your bosom we should be disappointed. He says: -

“Edward Turney renounced the fellowship of the Dowieites years ago, and now he renounces his renunciation, and asks them with open arms to come to his bosom; not, we would warn them, for the love of them, but for hatred of others against whom he can use them. They will find the bosom cold, when the heat of present hate subsides.”

Pitying the animus here manifest, and assuming the consummation and its predicted result, I fail to perceive that “coldness,” though an undesirable quality, is so deadly a sin as to warrant separation or withdrawal from fellowship. Where is the Scripture authority for the disciple being up to a given standard of spiritual temperature before he is worthy of the fellowship of his brethren in Christ? And even supposing there was, where is the brother who will set himself up as the ecclesiastical thermometer by which the temperature of the brethren shall be tested? Is not this one of the things which must be left to the decision of the great Searcher of hearts at the judgment of the great day? But the editor mentions certain reasons for which the Dowieites were withdrawn from, which now require to be noticed. He says:

-

“The friends of the truth withdrew from the Dowieites for a variety of reasons, principal among which was their parley with the popular doctrine of the immortality of the soul in the matter of fellowship; their belief in a supernatural devil; their denial that the living and dead, faithful and unfaithful, will have to give an account at the appearing of Christ; their non-belief in the Messianic character of the Psalms of David; the practical destruction of the Apocalypse, in denying its historic bearing and symbolical character; and their fellowship of the world in politics and otherwise.”

I feel a little surprised, though not the least sorry, that one reason is here conspicuous by its absence. I refer to the denial on the part of many of us of what has been termed “mortal resurrection.” The absence of this reason I accept as evidence that a concession on this point, made last year, is now, after mature consideration, confirmed. Why “politics” should be named as a valid reason for withdrawal and “mortal resurrection” left out, I cannot imagine except on the hypothesis I have suggested.

As to the reasons given I shall dismiss those of less importance as briefly as possible, before taking up the more serious.

And first, as to our denial of the Messianic character of the Psalms of David. One hardly knows how to deal with such a reason of withdrawal, expressed as it is in so slipshod a manner. An indictment to be legal must be clearly drawn and beyond misapprehension, otherwise the panel at the bar is entitled to plead a flaw, and so claim acquittal. But this count in our indictment has never been clearly stated before, nor is it in the present instance. Knowing the nature of the Birmingham Creed in its positive and negative aspects, I should construe such a reason thus: - It is a first principle of Birmingham faith that the whole of the Psalms are Messianic; and the fable to be rejected is that only a portion of the Psalms are Messianic. But one unacquainted with the Birmingham method would at once conclude that the parties withdrawn from deny that any of the Psalms are Messianic. And this natural construction of his words the editor well knows to be utterly untrue.

But is there such an article in the Birmingham Creed? And do its adherents really hold that every Psalm relates to the Messiah? I feel certain that such an article was not to be found in the creed in the early part of last year; and if it is there now it must have been inserted when the creed was undergoing

repairs. But if not, why speak of the Psalms at all as a reason of withdrawal? Where there is no law there is surely no transgression.

Next as to politics. The same remarks apply here. Is it a violation of the Birmingham creed for a brother to vote in a municipal or parliamentary election? I never heard of such an article. Is not this one of the elements of worldly conformity to be left to the conscience and discretion of the individual, the teaching of the brethren, and the final decision of the great Judge of all?

Again. We are said to deny the historic bearing and symbolical character of the Apocalypse. I ask again - Is it an article of the Birmingham Creed that the Apocalypse is entirely symbolical without a particle of plain literal statement from beginning to end? I have seen no such article. But does any Christadelphian really entertain such a view of the Revelation? I never heard any one maintain it. Then, on the other hand, are we charged with denying that any portion of that book is symbolical? I do not know one who does so. Any difference that exists, therefore, must be only in degree, which reduces the value of such a reason to a point where principle becomes imperceptible.

Its "historic bearing" may shew a more marked difference, but it is a mere difference in opinion, involving no violation of any element of the faith of the Gospel. Surely no Christadelphian holds that the Apocalypse is all fulfilled, any more than any of us believes it to be all future.

These reasons, whether based on the Birmingham Creed, or merely existing in the mind of the editor, appear to me to be altogether inadmissible as warranting separation among those who believe the gospel of the kingdom with an intelligent and hearty faith, and have confessed the name of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God. But to parade these as valid reasons of withdrawal, when they are too insignificant to be inserted in a creed extending already to thirty-five articles, is nothing short of high-handed presumption and utter disregard of conscientiousness. If a creed must be framed, let it contain everything deemed essential. If the editor's memory or note-book is good enough for some articles of faith, why not for all?

There remain to be considered three other reasons, and as they are contained in the Birmingham Creed, they demand special attention.

First; some of the so-called Dowieites believe in the existence of a supernatural devil. Granted. But what authority has anyone to make non-belief in such a being an article of faith, and to exclude from fellowship those who believe they have good Scriptural grounds for holding that a supernatural devil exists? Do not Christadelphians believe that a serpent possessing the power of human speech existed in the Garden of Eden? Do they not acknowledge that in the sentence pronounced on the serpent the loss of speech formed no part? Do they not admit that no race of serpents naturally possess the power of human speech? In this view of the case, would it imperil the salvation of a Birmingham Christadelphian if he were to be of opinion that the serpent was a supernatural devil? Is it the doctrine of the Birmingham Creed that human speech was a natural endowment of the serpent? The book does not say so; neither does it say it was supernatural. But in the absence of authoritative data, is the one not as admissible as the other? But why should a baptised believer, who does not acknowledge Birmingham as an infallible source of divinity, be excluded from Christian fellowship and the social amenities connected therewith, simply because he inclines to the supernatural view?

But none of us have any faith in the immortality of the devil, as some would have us to be considered. Those among us who believe in the existence of a supernatural devil, believe he shall be destroyed by Christ, and that consequently a time will come when there shall be no supernatural devil in existence. Is not this a sufficient offset against the mere circumstance of belief in a mortal though supernatural agent of evil?

Next in the category is "their denial that the living and dead, faithful and unfaithful, will have to give an account at the appearing of Christ." Passing over the looseness with which this reason is expressed, I submit that any difference that exists on this point does not affect the substance of the truth concerning the judgment of the great day, but merely a matter of time - call it an inch or a mile, a day or a thousand years. This difference is simply whether two classes shall stand simultaneously before the judgment seat. This difference is infinitesimal compared with the substantial agreement which exists in regard to the main element of the truth, as to the judgment itself, as broadly declared in Scripture.

Permit me to observe on this part of the subject, that the reason why there is any difference here is that there is no express Scripture which affirms the simultaneous judgment of the two classes. The conclusion is reached by a process of reasoning. This should surely teach us a little toleration. But more than this; scripture does not confine the judgment to the appearing of Christ, as the editor expresses it. For besides the judgment at the close of the millennium, acknowledged by the editor in the number I am

treating of, it is expressly declared that Christ “shall judge the living and the dead at His appearing, and His Kingdom.”

This shews that the judgment is not necessarily confined to the precise point of His appearing, but may extend forward into “His kingdom,” of which it is declared “there shall be no end.” Surely there is no ground in these circumstances for making a simultaneous judgment an article of faith.

The last remaining reason is “their parley with the popular doctrine of the immortality of the soul, in the matter of fellowship.” I have put this reason in its right place - last in the series; but it will be observed that the editor puts it first among principal reasons. Now, no one knows better than he that with the exception of what took place in connection with the Aberdeen church, and that only last year, all the separation that now obtains among the brotherhood took place before this reason had any existence. For example, the reason why sixteen members left the church in Edinburgh, in 1862, is extant in their correspondent’s own handwriting as simply a matter of voting at Church meetings, without any reference to doctrine whatever, at the same time addressing us as “Dear Brethren.” How the editor can put the immortality question first among chief reasons, and maintain a reputation for honest dealing, I leave it to himself and your readers to judge.

But let us look at the reason itself. It is so expressed as to lead anyone to suppose that persons believing in the immortality of the soul had ben knowingly introduced to the fellowship of the brethren. Now I know for a fact that such was never attempted by anyone in Edinburgh. The only question that arose on this subject had relation to the necessity for this idea being renounced before baptism. But even this question had no practical value, as it was distinctly declared by those who were dubious on the point, that their practice was and should be to baptize only such as declared their belief in immortality through Christ alone.

In speaking of the non-necessity of believing in life in Christ before baptism, let it be understood that it was in the supposed case of a believer in the things of the kingdom and in Jesus as the Christ, and consequently holding that the kingdom can be inherited only by one fashioned like the glorious body of Christ, and not by an immortal soul; and that this is the exclusive privilege of the faithful. This question, so far as it was a question, was based on the alleged fact that the kingdom and the Messiahship of Jesus were the things most prominently and directly preached by the apostles. Hence the language “gospel of the kingdom,” etc., not “gospel of eternal life.” But, notwithstanding this, the practical result is and has been, that there is not in the entire community a single individual who believes in the “popular doctrine of the immortality of the soul.”

But where is division to end, if points about which intelligent disciples may honestly differ are insisted on? Another separation by Birmingham has recently taken place, for another reason also open to question. We have received a warning, the onus of disregarding which I accept. But is not a warning called for in the opposite direction? There may be other questionable points in the creed, and who shall say that there shall not arise other Handleys and Turneys and Jardines to assert their liberty to differ from man-made articles of faith? Like causes produce like effects. “As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.”

J. CAMERON. Edinburgh.

(Though this letter favours “a few things” in which we cannot concur – immortal rising, to wit - it is, on the whole, such a reasonable and straightforward defence against despotism that we think good will be done by publishing it. – Editor.]

To the Editor of the “Christadelphian Lamp”:

“COMMITTED TO DR. THOMAS.”

Yea and nay is too frequent a style of speech with the editor of the “Christadelphian.” Everybody that takes exception to his dictum either misunderstands or misrepresents him. He never admits a mistake or slip. It would almost seem to be a subordinate article in his creed that he must on all matters speak like an oracle, let all others sit and listen. So that when he finds himself questioned and put in a dilemma, he immediately sets to interpret himself raising this and lowering that, till, presto - how stupid you were not to see what he meant all the time! He attempts in his August issue, and in his peculiar way, to tell a

correspondent how he is to be understood as standing “committed” to Dr. Thomas’s later expositions. And the explanation is also peculiar. He says, we have confessed ourselves committed to Dr. Thomas as a succinct mode of describing what our position is doctrinally, and not as setting forth the reason for that position. This plan is good enough, and may be serviceable, as when a man may want to save much explanation to a friend, he finds a royal road to making known the quality of his faith by saying, “Oh, I believe with Dr. so-and-so!” Very good, but did “the editor” simply mean that and nothing more? What means all this vowing “for better, for worse,” this “entrenching” of himself in the views of truth which Dr. Thomas, finally made known? Does it not mean that he, the editor, determines and vows that he will never, NEVER differ from Dr. Thomas’s final ideas of the truth? If his words do not signify that, what is their sense? Of course “the editor” will declare we are cavilling, and as it may be inconvenient to answer such questions, he may affect to treat them with silent contempt. But he proceeds to give his correspondent, L. O., the “reason” for being committed to Dr. Thomas, and here it is: - “We are able to see and demonstrate that Dr. Thomas’s position was in accordance with the holy oracles.” Well, what then? That just amounts to saying that R. Roberts is of the same mind with Dr. Thomas in reference to the gospel, but where is the need of being committed the one to the other? The editor with a boldness, which, from his stand point, is dangerous, claims to be the judge of Dr. Thomas. He weighed him in the balance and found him sufficient; but what gave him the power to judge of the correctness of Dr. Thomas’s faith? Did that ability not make him also equal to any Doctor under the sun, so far as knowing what to believe for himself is concerned? Because you recognize someone else as being in a “position in accordance with the holy oracles” is that a good reason for straightway committing yourself to that one “for better, for worse”? Would the better way not be to feel glad over the harmony and hope that it might continue; but since man, whose breath is in his nostrils, is a fickle creature and given to strange freaks, keep aloof from any committal. Dr. Thomas is dead (let us rejoice in the good he did), and his final expositions will therefore remain as they; but are they any more the better for being final? Does that give them their value? Surely not.

Now here is a matter for the editor’s reason. He says he has long since given up all idea of such a thing as the employment of reason in order to shut the mouths of cavillers, but here he might well use it to enlighten his enquiring friends, if not mayhap convince himself, that to be committed to any man’s word, however wise and good the man may be, or had been, is not a safe position when life or death hangs upon a right choice. Let us commit ourselves to the truth as it is in Jesus. Dr. Thomas would have been the last man on earth to commit himself to anyone’s word. Robert Roberts would do well to follow his example in that respect. If R. Roberts meant no more than that he perceives Dr. Thomas to have been right in his conception of the teaching of Scripture, then he used most extraordinary language in the June number to convey that impression, and it is little wonder that simple minds do not understand him. If he still holds by the language he used, he has now diluted the statement of his position to his correspondent till it means nothing in particular, no more than one brother may say to another at any time. In justice to his readers he should again interpret himself, for he has left them with a yea and a nay. What does he really admit?

ANDRONICUS.

We perfectly agree with “Andronicus” that nobody was further than Dr. Thomas from the absurd and popish position of Mr. Roberts. The Doctor was pre-eminently a man of progress in the divine word. His last days were spent in considering flesh in a new aspect; but Mr. Roberts has reached the summit of the whole truth, and there he proclaims his intention to “stand” like Simon Stylites on the top of his pillar. Well, let him “stand”; we prefer to “go on unto perfection,” if by any means we may attain thereunto. - EDITOR.]

To the Editor of the “Christadelphian Lamp”

Adeline, Ogle County, Illinois, U.S of America, July 30th, 1874.

Dear Bro. Turney, - Some six months since, I had the pleasure of writing you on a subject in which the Brethren at large appeared to be intensely interested. The candid, courteous, and manly way in which you met those points with which you could not agree, induces me to address you again on this topic, and believe me, Bro. Turney, it is with no idea of cavilling, or for the sake of seeking to establish a theory, that I do so. I firmly believe what I endeavour to set forth is the truth of God, taught in His word. To this

authority I am ever willing to appeal, and it is my earnest desire to stand upon that foundation; hence, I shall esteem it a favor, if I am wrong, to be put right, for what advantage do I gain by an imperfect, or incorrect understanding of the glorious doctrine of the ever blessed Son of God. On this subject it appears to be impossible so to write as not to be misunderstood, and as I have no desire to cast stumbling-blocks in the path of those who desire to understand me correctly, I will endeavour to be as lucid in my remarks as it is possible for me to be, without sacrificing the testimonies laid down for our acceptance. I do not intend to teach that the invisible God was born in the city of Bethlehem, and I do not think you so understand me, but rather that my language is calculated to produce such an impression. I say that the visible image of the invisible God, or a manifestation of this only true God, was the personage born; God's son, whose name He was by birthright fully entitled to bear, hence it will be observed that the same word precisely, is used in the 11th verse of the 2nd chap. of Luke, to designate the son, as is applied in the 9th, 23rd, 24th, and 26th verses to the invisible Deity and Father; the original of which I apprehend, is the Greek word Kurios, answering to the Hebrew Adon.

This, then, should not be found a stumbling-block. The Father's name, which is a symbol of Himself, is applied to the Son, by the Father, through the Prophets, in a great many instances, a few of which are the following: "So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver, and the Jehovah said unto me, Cast it unto the potter, a goodly price that I was priced at of them." (Zech. x. 12, 13). "And they shall look upon me (Jehovah) whom they have pierced." Ibid xii. 10. "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion; for lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Jehovah." Ibid ii. 10. See also Zeph. iii., 15, 16, 17., Psa. cxxxii. 13, 14. Joel iii. 16, 17. Isai. xxv. 8, 9. In the consideration of these passages, it must be borne in mind that the word LORD in the Old Testament, when printed in small capitals, is invariably the English equivalent for Jehovah. This being so, we must see in them an overwhelming confirmation of the fact, that Jesus was so literally and so truly God's Son, that He not only could be called Jehovah, even in the days of His flesh, as a meaningless title, but that He was Jehovah. He thought it not robbery to be equal with God (though the Jews did), nor to bear His Father's name. This is more forcibly illustrated when we refer to the Father Jehovah's challenge by the Prophet: "To whom will ye liken me, or to whom shall I be equal, saith the Holy One?" (Tsai. xl. 25., xlv. 5.) The voice from the excellent Glory attesting: "This is my beloved Son, hear ye Him" (Matt. xvii. 5,) is a satisfactory answer to this question, in view of the Son's declaration, "I and my Father are one." This is not to be explained, as some would do, by saying He was His Father's representative; He was far more than this. To borrow an illustration from the natural man, we might suppose President Grant to send an ambassador to the court of Great Britain with power and authority to act for him. This would be a representative; but suppose, instead, He should send an only Son with power and authority to do His "Father's business" would He not "come in His Father's name," and would he not be great just as much as His Father? And seeing this His Father's name would be His by inheritance and therefore a true name, could it not be said of Him as was said of Levi that He pre-existed in His ancestor's loins? This of course is not a perfect illustration in all points. Spirit, or Deity substance, seems to be above the present finite comprehension of man. What little we do know of it goes to show the vast and bewildering superiority of ail or spirit, over poor corruptible flesh and blood, it is therefore not to the point to say that, because a man of flesh and blood cannot fill two places at the same time, therefore Deity cannot, this being virtually what the arguments of some result in, who are zealous for what they think the truth, but who do not apprehend the greatness of ail. The Son was Immanuel or God with us, the fellow of Deity; and as you shew in your remarks of Zech. xiii. 7, the original of this word "fellow" denotes "one upon the same level in society." Therefore this title never has been, nor can it be, applied either to angels, or to men. The servants of God's household are not His "fellow" but His Son is. That this equality is relative is obvious from the fact that a man's son may not be absolutely his father's equal either in wisdom, knowledge, or power, but in society he is, as contradistinguished from the servants, who are not. This relative equality, however, must not be used as a means of destroying the testimony laid down by John the Baptist, who was sent to prepare the way of Jehovah Elohim.

The Father as the Spirit-dove, and Jesus as the Son, were the Elohim. The Father was Jehovah, and His Son most assuredly was Jehovah; in other words, Jehovah had at this time become Elohim. He who had goings forth from the days of eternity was manifested, first, as a Son; and secondly, as the Spirit-dove. Here is plurality truly, as you say, but not trinity.

John's declaration concerning Jesus existing before him chronologically is very strong, and liable to mislead those who have not taken a thorough and comprehensive view of this exalted subject. Whoever he may be contemplating, he points to Jesus, as the one, whose shoes' latchet he was not worthy to unloose, and using the personal pronoun he declares, "HE was before me," and "He that is from above is above all." There is not the shadow of a doubt but that, in this case, John identifies Jesus with his origin;

and not only is this the case with John, but all the apostles who treat of this aspect of the Son of God do the same thing.

I do not believe, neither do I teach, that Jesus pre-existed before His birth, as a being separate from God, “the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; nor do I know of a single instance, in the Christadelphian body, where this erroneous view is held; and if I use language that seems to favour this error, it is because I use the identical phrases that Jesus and His apostles did. Therefore, if a man say, Do you believe that Jesus was before John? I reply, emphatically, I do; but, not to be misunderstood I might reply, And what do you understand the name Jesus to be the symbol of? The babe born of Mary. And where did that babe come from? “I came down from heaven.” “I proceeded forth and came from God,” says Jesus Himself. Here is the answer from the best possible authority we can have, His origin was in God who begat Him, for without that Spirit-germ there would have been neither hands, feet, body, nor brain; these all resulted from that germ which caused Mary to conceive, hence He says, “I am the bread which came down from heaven,” and “the bread of life which I give for the life of the world is my flesh” The acorn, it is said, contains the future oak, which is nourished from the soil in which it grows; so with this divine germ nourished and fed, as it were, of Mary’s substance. The literal begetting of Jesus is indeed the key to this great doctrine, and I am glad to see you declare, in a letter to Bro. Jacobs, of Chicago, that we cannot insist too strongly on the literality of this begetting. If this be the correct scriptural teaching, and I heartily believe it is, then there seems to be no question as to whether He inherited His Father’s substance or not. Was ever a begotten son known to exist that did not originate in his father, thereby inheriting his father’s substance or nature, afterwards manifested or made known in attributes. In the language of Scripture, sons issue from their father’s loins (Gen. xxxv. 11); they have their origin there; consequently partake of their father’s nature. Now if Jesus were truly a begotten Son – and we claim most strenuously that He was, does not this fact establish what I contend for? There is in this case a wide difference between creation and begetting. The Deity might have fashioned a babe from the substance of Mary, as He did Adam from the dust of the ground, but this would have been a creation and not a begetting; and though the product might have been a son of the woman, it would certainly not have been the begotten Son, or the Seed of God, as you render Isaiah liii. 1. The first man, Adam, sprang from the earth; the second man or Adam, was “from above”, “the Jehovah from heaven” who “came down from heaven.” The origin of the one is as superior to the other as the heavens are higher than the earth, and if the origin differs so widely did not the products also differ in proportion? The perfection of humanity was to be found in John the Baptist, according to the testimony of Jesus, and it is recorded that, he (John) was filled, with the Spirit from his mother’s womb (Luke i. 15), yet of himself he says, “He that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth” (Jno. iii. 31). The greatest of prophets, then, was earthly, and spoke of the earth, because he originated there, like all mankind. But mark the superiority of the Son of God, “He that cometh from above is above all;” and why so? The answer is obvious; because He came “from heaven” (Jno. iii. 31). Did this origin “from above” make Him no better than John, as regards substance or nature? In other words, was He of the earth, that is, of Mary’s substance only? If we say He was, then He spoke of earthly things like John. But this conclusion is not admissible for one moment in the face of the evidence that He was “from above.” and therefore “above all. Heaven and earth met in Jesus, or His words have no meaning, and His name, Immanu-AIL (God with us) would be a false one. In this connection we may revert to Micah v. 2. “But thou, Bethlehem Ephrathah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto Me, that is to be ruler in Israel: whose goings forth have been from of old from everlasting.” The construction of this passage proves, first that a future Ruler should be born in Bethlehem; and, secondly, that this to-be-Ruler that had goings forth from eternity. Now, who but Jehovah is this future Ruler? As it is written, and the Jehovah shall be king over all the earth; in that day shall there be one Jehovah, and His name one” (Zech. xiv. 9). And again: Who but Jehovah had goings forth in ancient times, manifesting himself to Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses ; in the pillar of cloud by day, and fire by night; upon the tabernacle (which is a beautiful type of Jesus); dwelling between the cherubim, over the mercy-seat, in the temple built by Solomon? The glory and the light of Israel - He who had spoken in times past by the fathers, did in the “latter days” speak by a Son who bore His Father’s name, as He Himself declares, “I am come in My Father’s name” (Jno. v. 43), “And they shall call His name Emmanuel (Matt. i. 23). The mode of manifestation in His case differed from any previous display of power, but, the result was the same - a manifestation of that invisible God who led the children of Israel in the wilderness, and who, as their Shepherd, had dwelt between the cherubim (Psa. lxxx. 1). God’s only begotten Son, then, ranks high above all humanity in one most important respect, which would be difficult to overestimate, and that is, His divine origin; He “proceeded forth, and came from God, who sent Him as the bread of life, to give salvation to a perishing world; herein is the love of

God manifested “towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ (His Son) died for us. The extraordinary prophecies concerning Him, and the remarkable discourses He uttered concerning Himself, have puzzled past ages and generations, and have produced more intense and bitter contentions than probably any other subject yet set forth in the scriptures. We, who are waiting for Him, who are His brethren should, of all people in the world, understand and faithfully receive His savings. Let us give them our prayerful study and meditation, and our reward will be great.

Faithfully yours, JOHN D. COFFMAN.

[This letter contains many excellent things, and leaves the writer of it much less liable, as we think, to be misunderstood than his former communication; but, as it is probable that some of our readers will ask what he means by substance of God, as applied to Jesus, perhaps he will keep that point before him in his next article. The term substance of God indicates to most peoples’ minds deathless substance, but we do not apprehend brother Coffman means that. – EDITOR.]

A POLITICAL TERROR.

It has been for years a special feature of our lecturing to speak of the growth of Russia as a sign of the fulfilment of various prophecies. And though the subject is sometimes dropped for considerable intervals of time, we find it forcing itself anew upon our attention. The following article, taken from The Daily News, will justify all we have said on this head, and cannot fail of awakening an interest in the prophetic word. We have always contended that Russia was able, by her superior dead weight, if set in motion, to drive the rest of Europe into the Mediterranean; we still maintain this view, notwithstanding much “respectable opinion” to the contrary. Also that she will have at no very distant date every incentive for such an attempt. If we read prophecy aright, broken she must be in the Holy Land; but before that she will make the heart of Europe tremble in the midst of her bowels.

RUSSIA AS IT IS.

Samara, on the Volga, August 24. - The traveller in the neighbourhood of the Caspian Sea who wishes to proceed to the great fair of Nijui-Novgorod will find that his route to the great Yarmak lies through the most interesting portion of the Russian Empire. Provided he allows himself sufficient time to visit the different settlements on the banks of the Volga, a trip up that river from Astrakhan will afford him more varied entertainment than would probably any journey of equal duration in the world. On the banks of the Volga he can find as it were samples of the different varieties of the human species - Fins (Ugrians), Tartars, Kalmucks, not to speak of Teutons and Slaves - collected into batches as if for the special convenience of the ethnological student. Russia is in this respect the most picturesque of countries - picturesque not certainly in its natural scenery which consists for the most part of monotonous and endless plain, but in the races which people them. There are no less thirty-six different races included in the Russian dominions. Some of these, and the most interesting, are to be seen, not in a state of fusion with others, but each living a life of its own, intermarrying only among its own, preserving its own peculiar institutions, manners, customs, language, and religion, apparently absolutely unaffected by the civilization of the country in the midst of which they have pitched their camps. It is a common complaint that civilization is improving varieties off the face of the earth – that one variety after another is dying out, one province after another losing its peculiar characteristics, and fashioning itself after some common type of the national character. Everywhere in Europe, except perhaps in Spain, is this levelling process at work. It is essentially so in France; it is rapidly becoming the case in Germany; it is more or less so even in Italy; and England has for a long time past been exhibiting the same phenomenon. But in Russia, and for an obvious cause, it is less the case than anywhere in Europe. The obvious cause is that Russia is not a nation, but a continent, and, estimating civilization by the progress of the steam-engine, only a half-civilized continent. But whatever Russia may lose in this way she undoubtedly gains in picturesqueness. With her the assimilation of her numerous race’s proceeds by far slower and more measured steps than elsewhere, if indeed it can be said to proceed at all. The German colonist of a century ago is still the German colonist with his Teuton ways uncontaminated by Slavonic manners, and his German tongue innocent of the Russian language. The wild Nomad Kirghis, if somewhat less wild, is still the nomad Kirghis, his occupation is still that of a herdsman, his home the saddle and the tent. The Tartar, together

with his peculiar dress, present his ancient religion, and the manners and customs of his ancestors. The tradition of once being the conquering race and having belonged to one of the great Khanates founded by the successors of the conquering Timur is not yet dead among them. And wildest and most picturesque of all, the huge and hideous Kalmuck presents on the Steppes of Russia an exact reflection of the manners and customs of his brethren in Dzingaria. Nor is it among the so-called Tatar races alone that these conservative tendencies are to be found. The Mordoins, the Tsheremis, and the Tchuvaskes exhibit to us the faithful representation of uncontaminated primitive Ugrian (Fin) life. All these different races can be passed as it were in review in the course of a trip up the Volga to Nijni-Novgorod.

I have said that Russia is not a country but a continent. Her giant tracts bear no resemblance to anything you find in Europe. In the north there is a single tract of forest covering a superficies as large as the whole of Spain; then another large tract inhabited by a population engaged in every variety of industry, and dependent on these northern forests; then another enormous tract, twice the size of France, of deep black soil (Tcherne Zeme), which has for more than a century past yielded the richest crops of wheat, and has never seen manure; then to the south and south-east, another huge tract of steppes, only waiting for an increase of population to become one of the most fertile in the world. Then, away across the Urals, another limitless tract, rather another continent than a country, the Asiatic reserve of the European giant. The population inhabiting these tracts amounts at present to sixty millions. By the end of the century it is calculated that it will reach a hundred millions; and the resources of the country are considered capable of sustaining, without a strain, a hundred and seventy millions of inhabitants. Of the 60,000,000 present inhabitants, thirty-five millions of homogeneous Slaves form the backbone of the nation, a larger mass of homogeneous people than is to be found anywhere else.

The unity and integrity of a country so composed can never be seriously threatened. Besides, with the exception of the Poles, even the most wild and heterogeneous tribes to be found within its borders yield a ready and unquestioning obedience to a Government which, by long experience, knows how to deal with its numerous races, applying a Lesbian rule to the requirements and capacities of each, but at the same time extracting military service and tribute from them all.

Such and so great is the Russia of the present day, with her boundless resources, with all the appliances and secrets of modern civilization and science at her command, with the most autocratic and, for national purposes, centralised Government in the world, and with universal conscription. She is, indeed, not a nation, but a continent, and an armed and drilled continent into the bargain. It is impossible to contemplate this giant power without musing on the possibilities of the future, perhaps, too, no very distant future. One thing is quite clear; the Russia of to-day is no more the Russia of the Crimean war than it is the Russia of Boris Godounoff. No event in history ever marked an era in a nation's life more distinctly than did the Crimean war in that of Russia. That war may be said to have produced two distinct ultimate effects. It ruined Turkey, and it regenerated Russia. It ruined Turkey by commanding her finances and teaching her the fatal secret of a national debt, which the Turk has since worked out to the inevitable conclusion of national bankruptcy. It regenerated Russia by showing her the weak parts in her cuirass, the corruption of her Administration, the absence of means of internal communication, and the want of vigour and intelligence in a portion of her population. She, too, has improved the lesson. Every branch of her Administration has been reformed; corruption, if not absolutely rooted out, has at any rate been checked and compelled to hide its head; a network of railways has been undertaken, the most important lines of which are now completed, connecting the heart of the empire with its most distant members; and, greatest triumph of all, the emancipation of the serf was resolved upon, and, in spite of all obstacles, has been successfully carried out, a measure which, by stimulating the free energies, cannot fail to develop the intelligence of the great mass of the rural population of the country. In fact there has been progress - great, rapid, and astounding progress, material, social, and moral progress, along the whole line.

Nor must we omit political progress. Russia's action in the matter of Poland has not generally been fully comprehended. It is known that the viceroyalty has been abolished, and the Grand Duchy of Warsaw converted into the "Province of the Vistula," with all that such a change denotes; that a severely repressive system has been introduced in the administration of these provinces; and that a law equivalent to confiscation has been applied to the large landed proprietors.

But all this has been the least important part of Russia's action in the matter. The real key of the Polish question was not Poland, but Lithuania. The Lithuanian provinces had been united to the ancient kingdom of Poland since the end of the fourteenth century, by the marriage of Jagellon, Prince of Lithuania with Hedwig, the reigning Queen of Poland. Since that time the destinies of the two people had been joined together for better and for worse, until forcibly dissevered by Russia. Public opinion in Russia - and this is not generally known abroad, and was singularly ignored in Earl Russell's despatches

on the subject – would have been quite willing to make any sacrifice, even to the granting of autonomy, with reference to Poland proper, i.e., the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. The chief organ of public opinion in Moscow was allowed openly to advocate this solution of the Polish difficulty. It was the Poles themselves who rejected it. They had no desire for a sham and delusive independence, and they knew well that the independence of a microscopic kingdom such as it was proposed to establish, surrounded on all sides by the great Military Powers, and with no outlet towards the sea, would have been a mockery indeed, and its liberty of action a delusion. They, therefore, unhesitatingly rejected the proffered gift, and insisted on their ancient provinces of Lithuania sharing their fortunes, and, if it could be achieved, their independence. From that moment all thoughts of effecting a peaceful solution of the Polish question died out in Russia. This claim of the Polish people to what the Russians called their Western Provinces was the tocsin which roused the patriotism of the nation, and the unequal struggle commenced. It was essentially and distinctly a struggle not for Poland, but for Lithuania, where the proprietors and ruling class were Poles, but the peasant belonged to a different but kindred branch of the great Sclavic or Sarmatian family, more nearly allied to the Lett population of Livonia and Courland than either to the Russian or the Pole. If left to himself, the Lithuanian peasant would probably have been indifferent as to the result of the struggle; but he was easily carried away, as the mean white was by the Southern planter, by the influence and example of his Polish proprietor. Western Europe, after a moment's hesitation, declined to interfere, and there could therefore be but one issue to the contest. The rebellion was, after a short and heroic struggle, effectually stamped out. From that moment the chief action of Russia has been directed not to Poland but to Lithuania. In Poland, in spite of all her efforts, she is not sanguine of effecting any lasting result. There peasant and proprietor seem banded together in a common religion of undying hatred to her rule. She may confiscate his property from the landlord and divide it among his tenants; and the result is he will have twenty proprietors instead of one anxious to throw off her yoke. But Lithuania offers her a fairer field; let her only root out the proprietor, drive out the Polish element, and all may be well. It must be allowed that her system here has been thorough, and is meeting the reward of thoroughness. She has spared neither cost nor pains to get rid of the old Polish proprietors, and to substitute patriotic Russians in their place; she has forbidden the use of the Polish language in the schools, and she has good hope that the last trace of the old rebel Polish element will soon be eradicated in these provinces, and the country thoroughly Russianized. I wish now to point attention to the fact that when this is done the Polish difficulty will assume very different proportions for Russia from what it has hitherto done. It may not be wholly got rid of, but it will at any rate be reduced to manageable proportions. Russia's defensive, and consequently offensive, position in Europe will in consequence be immeasurably strengthened. The Polish question was an arm in the hands of an enemy who chose to use it against her. Austria, who after Turkey, or perhaps before Turkey has most to fear from Russia, possessed in Galicia a powder magazine to which she had only to apply a match in order to blow up her neighbour's house. That neighbour's house is now insured. Poland was the key of the position in Eastern Europe. Russia has now put that key into her pocket. Is it not clear that such a change alters the whole face of politics in Europe? This change too has been effected since the Crimean war. Add to this that there has been in the result of the Franco-German war a shuffle of the cards too obviously to the advantage of Russia, and, to crown all, and, as it were, to give a definite direction and purpose to all these changes, that a stringent military law of universal conscription has been decreed, and is now enforced throughout the Empire and I would ask whether it is any exaggeration of the fact to say that Russia is now ten times stronger than she was during the Crimean war when she was still able for two years to make head against a coalition; and I would further ask whether it is wise, prudent, or even rational for those who may have to meet this giant Power, perhaps at no very distant date, in the neighbourhood of the Balkans, the Carpathians, or the Himalayas, to remain in a state of comparative unpreparedness, rocking themselves, in a fool's paradise, with the soothing assurance that there is no danger.

INTELLIGENCE.

BIRMINGHAM, AUG. 25. - "When one member suffers, all the members suffer with him." A feeling of sympathy is our reason for publishing the following account of an accident to Brother Thomas Evans. The cutting was sent by Brother E. Field. - **MURDEROUS ENCOUNTER WITH A BURGLAR IN BIRMINGHAM.** Last night, a case of burglary, in which a house owner was murderously attacked, took place in this town. It was perpetrated at the residence of Mr. Thomas Evans, builder, of Crabtree Road,

Brookfields. The road is a rather lonely one, having few houses in it. About half-past eight o'clock in the evening, Mr. Evans, who is a bachelor, returned home from the town, and was alarmed at finding the side-door open, which he had secured on leaving the house a few hours previously. He entered the house, and heard foot-steps in an upper room. Suspecting that thieves were in possession of the house, he called out, and remained at the bottom of the stairs. A powerfully-built man immediately descended from a bed room, and before Mr. Evans had time to defend himself, dealt him a blow on the head with a large "jemmy," inflicting a nasty wound. Mr. Evans recovered himself, and he and the burglar closed. For some time a desperate struggle continued, during which Mr. Evans received some severe wounds on the head from his antagonist, who also attempted to throttle him. Mr. Evans at last with great difficulty managed to pull the burglar's hand from his throat, and raise an alarm. The neighbours came to his assistance and secured the burglar, who attempted to make his escape, keeping the neighbours at bay with his "Jemmy." Information was sent to Kenion Street Police Station, and Superintendent Spears sent Police constable Williams and another, who took the burglar into custody. He offered resistance but was secured by handcuffs. He gave his name as William Evans, engine-fitter, having no fixed abode. He will be brought before the magistrates today. Mr. Evans was conveyed to the General Hospital, where it was found that he had received twelve large scalp wounds, one being four inches in length and exposing the skull. He was also suffering greatly from exhaustion through loss of blood and severe injuries to his throat. He was detained at the hospital, and at midnight he was in a precarious condition. It was rumoured in the neighbourhood that a murder had been committed in the Crabtree Road, and considerable excitement prevailed in consequence, numbers of persons visiting the vicinity. - Brother Field says that Brethren Brown and Jones, of Spring Hill, had visited our unfortunate brother, found him quite sensible; that he had written a letter; but the doctors said they had not seen a worse case. We hope to hear of his improvement soon. No doubt justice will be found keen enough to remind the dastardly assailant of his cruel deed.

DALKEITH. - On the fifth of July of the present year, we, the brethren and sisters of the Dalkeith Christadelphian Synagogue (our number being nine), met together to form a light-stand in this dark and thoroughly church-going town of over six thousand inhabitants. Going to church is the rule in this place, and churches are in abundance, from the Mother of Harlots down to the last-born of the offspring of the apostacy. Previous to the date mentioned above, we belonged to the Tranent Ecclesia, but, having to walk from five to nine miles, we resolved for the convenience of all to meet in Dalkeith, and we took the opportunity of leaving Tranent on the occasion of Bro. Strathearn going to California; we have still, from three to four miles to walk; only two of our number live in Dalkeith. We have also to report the addition of six to our number by baptism, who put on the sin-covering name, after making the good confession; they were baptised on Sunday, 13th Sep.; their names are: John Reid, and his wife, Alexander Bulmain and his wife, Robert Reid, junr., Elizabeth Reid, all from the village of Courland, and sons and daughters of Bro. Reid. Our number now in Dalkeith is fifteen, and we shall be very glad to see any of the brethren in Dalkeith at any time; our place of meeting is the Scientific Hall; hour of meeting eleven O'clock -
GEORGE FAIRGRIEVE.

[We wish our brethren all possible good. The brethren at Tranent will miss them, but probably the great distance justifies the step. - ED.]

DEVONPORT. --The following, from Bro. Dashper is a sufficient rebuke to forged statements touching the condition of our cause in Morice Town, and also to show unity and resolution are created by recognising Jesus to have been free, and therefore able to set us free. "It is quite true that all the brethren and sisters at Plymouth - it should be Devonport - are "Renunciationists" and, in addition, they are doing their best to point out the way by which others may become "Renunciationists" also. To accomplish this end, they are proclaiming to men that they are the "slaves of sin" under sentence of death, and that they may, by faith and obedience, become united to One in every respect "free," which union secures their freedom also; and the very fact that they are "Renunciationists" gives them boldness in this work, for they see in the Scripture teaching concerning the Lord Jesus Christ the "Way" by which this can be accomplished. "The love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead."

DOUGLAS. ISLE of MAN. - Bro. Martin sends news of his recent visits to Leicester and Liverpool. At the later place he and Brother Lind spent much time among the brethren trying to shew that whereas all men in Adam are slaves, Christ and all in Him are free; and that the freedom of Christ was the consequence of His being the Son of God. We are pleased to see Brother Lind so active, and hope he will soon bring all his friends to oneness of mind. The following from the Isle of Man times, will shew what

Bro. Martin has been doing in the Isle of Man. We must say he works hard and spends his money freely for the truth. "LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST," A LECTURE ON THE "SEA SHORE," AND THE SEQUEL. -- The above forms the basis of a lecture delivered on the "sea shore," on Sunday evening last by Antipas, F. D. The position that the lecturer appears to take is, that the human race is absolutely mortal, apart from Christ, destined for an eternal grave. He regards Christendom in error in teaching what they call the "immortality of the soul" which he declares is a vague myth and destructive to the cardinal teachings of the Bible. Immortality, says Antipas, is a thing of promise and not at present possessed by any member of Adam's family. At the resurrection, men worthy of everlasting existence will receive the gift from the hands of Christ, who is the "resurrection and the life." It is the belief of the lecturer that the death state is one of blank or perfect unconsciousness, or, to express it in the language of one of his favourite texts, "in death there is no remembrance of Thee; and the dead know not anything; There is no knowledge or wisdom in the grave whither we go."

This view of the matter, the speaker thought, made the subject of resurrection deeply interesting, as well as completely extinguished the fables of Catholic and Protestant teachers on the point. The doctrine of purgatory is an invention, as is also the immediate ascension of souls to glory. The Bible doctrine is that men sleep from the day of their death till the morning of resurrection; so that instead of Abraham and the prophets, Paul and the Apostles being now rejoicing in heaven, they are asleep in the grave, waiting for the return of Christ to wake them up. The Scriptural doctrine of "Life only in Christ" not only makes Him supreme as the Saviour, but it establishes beyond a doubt that the wicked are not immortal, and that, therefore, the "monstrous" doctrine of everlasting frizzling, or torment is a wicked libel upon a God of love and compassion - This expression gave rise to a somewhat lengthy discussion, which, however, was not conducted in a very orderly manner, someone in the comply first asked where the Scripture proof was for the statement that Paul was asleep, to which the following reply was given: - "Most so-called Christians were agreed that the resurrection of the dead had not yet taken place, and that it would not take place until the second coming of Christ. Now, Paul looked for his reward at that time, for he wrote to Timothy on the eve of his departure, and said, "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, will give to me in that day, and not to me only, but unto all those who love His appearing." And, furthermore, he wrote of those who were like him in faith and hope and said if they, the dead in Christ, rise not, then they who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished. The next statement from the crowd was, "You select just a few passages to suit yourself, and upon them wish to build a new system of religion." What did Paul mean when he said "Absent from the body; present with the Lord"? The reply was, "I cannot quote the whole Bible on one night and therefore, I select such passages as I deem a reply to your question. I am not desirous of establishing a new religion, but I am very anxious to revive the old religion which has been for so many generations trodden under the feet of men. As to Paul's statement, "Absent from the body, present with the Lord" it is not fair for anyone to mutilate the Scriptures by singling out a phrase without regard for the context, but more especially is this wrong in a man who blames another for making selection of texts to suit sinister purposes. However, the Apostle meant what he said, and as he was looking to be clothed upon with his house from heaven (Jesus Christ), it follows that Paul is not yet absent from the body, and, therefore not yet present with the Lord. It was Paul's doctrine that all responsible ones would have to appear in body before the judgment seat of Christ, and that at that time the 'vile body' will be changed and made like the now 'glorious body' of the Lord Jesus Christ. When this overtakes Paul, he will be absent from the body and present with the Lord." But said the interrogator, "Paul's spirit went to Heaven when he died." "Agreed," said Antipas, "but Paul's spirit was not Paul. The body constituted the man, and that went into the grave." The death of Stephen was referred to for the same purpose, and with the same result. A somewhat lengthy debate then took place between another of the audience and the speaker upon the "dying thief" "on the cross, the "rich man and Lazarus," world-burning, etc. - which is too intricate and long for us to follow; but before the meeting broke up, some one intimated that the destiny of the wicked was not death in the absolute sense; but in the Scriptural sense, which was eternal life in torment. Therefore it would be correct to read the passage in Romans, quoted by the lecturer, "The wages of sin is eternal life in torment." To this a brief but terse reply was given. Said the speaker: "We will accept your definition of the word death. Now, for the sake of showing the absurdity of such nonsense, we read in Revelation that, "There shall be no more death." Now, let us apply the principle, and read as your position would require us to read, "There shall be no more eternal life in torment." Let us thank a gracious God there never was any "eternal life in torment;" nor will there ever be. Evil, pain, and all wickedness will, one day, and that before very long, be extinct." - This concluded the discussion; and now the audience began to make use of some curious epithets, such as "He is a paid secularist, and comes over here every

season,” “Let us duck him,” etc., etc.; and as the lecture was delivered on the wall, just immediately behind the lifeboat shed, it was with some difficulty that the speaker pushed through the crowd on to the Promenade. This accomplished, he was followed by most of his hearers along to the Iron Pier, whereon he took refuge from the ill-behaved and yelling mob. We have little or no sympathy with the theories which Antipas advocates; but we have less with those who resort to this un-English mode of persecuting him. Let argument be met by argument and not by brutish and ignorant violence EDINBURGH, SEP. 5. - Dear Bro. Turney, on leaving the Isle of Man, I made it my business to call at Barrow-in-Furness, to see our Bro. John Barrow and his mother, who are the only Christadelphians in the town. We had not exchanged many words before we gravitated into the subject which has disturbed the Christadelphian world of late. We arranged for a meeting at my lodgings in the evening, on which occasion I endeavoured to point out the superior origin of the Lord Jesus Christ over the descendants of Adam, and this constituted Him “Mighty to save;” that God being His Father, He was not indebted to any human being for His life. This being so, His life was His OWN, not forfeited. He was never in Adam, but was born in God’s family and, therefore, unlike us, did not require to be adopted into it. We were born under sentence of death; He was not, but laid His life down for our redemption of His own free will. “This” said Bro. Barrow, “is what I believe, and is what I understood Bro. Thomas and Bro. Roberts wished to set forth.” “And,” said I, “what do you understand Bro. Turney is endeavouring to teach?” “Well,” he said, “I understand that he affirmed that Christ did not come in the flesh and that he could not sin and could not die.” We next laboured to show that our brother was entirely mistaken as to the teaching of Brother Roberts and briefly stated both positions; but as time was short, we recommended the perusal of the Lamp, of the existence of which Bro. Barrow had not heard. You may hear from him; however, he frankly admitted that he did not believe in a Christ that was condemned with the whole human race. His address is, Mr. John Barrow, ironmonger, etc., Preston St. Barrow.in-Furness. We resumed our journey northwards, and, after making short stays at Whitehaven (the town where Murphy, the Protestant lecturer, received his death blow), Carlisle, and Dumfries, we duly arrived at Edinburgh, and, having secured lodgings, we called upon Bro. Chas. Smith, whom we found busy, baking “the bread that perisheth.” He did not display much desire to talk upon the subject, but was (as he always is) very courteous. In reference to the subject itself he said, “we have gone through it all five years ago;” at which remark I asked, “Was it so clearly defined as it now is?” “O, yes.” Said he, “just the same.” “How do you feel, since Bro. Turney’s visit,” said I, “are you moved, or do you stand on the same ground you have always been known to occupy?” “I am just where I was, and there I shall remain; the fact is, it is all humbug from beginning to end, and it is coming upon all the churches;” by which remark I understood him to mean that we, in common with all the Catholic and Protestant churches, were the subjects of a predicted delusion. To-day (Saturday) I saw Bro. James Mewhort, who seems willing to move his position when he understands the Scriptures require him to do so; and for the purpose of ventilating the question again in Edinburgh he has very kindly promised to open his house for as many brethren as are disposed to meet, to talk the matter over. In my next I will tell you the results of the said meeting. Should it take place in the meantime, let it suffice to say that while here, as elsewhere and always, we intend to “honour the Son” of Jehovah. - Yours, in the one hope of eternal life, JAMES MARTIN

GLASGOW – Writing on the 10th inst., Bro. O’Neil tells us with great gladness that the more he searches, the more confirmed he is that not a line of Scripture exists to prove Jesus to have been under the universal sentence pronounced on man through Adam; and also that not one passage exists to shew that Jesus died for Himself, while great numbers are found plainly stating that He died for us. Talk of “mere manism,” who, he asks, are teachers of this? those who affirm Jesus not under condemnation, or those who put Him in the same condemnation as ourselves? The latter, undoubtedly. He had received a deputation of three, and spent from one to two hours; but their inability to find one text to support their view only fortified him all the more. Our vices and “riches” were contrasted with certain “virtues” and poverty, but there was nothing beyond assertion. Bro. O’Neil replied that personalities had nothing to do with the question in hand, and that they ought to take a charitable view of their opponents. He adds, I am now finally separated from their meeting. In a former letter he had accused Bro. Nisbet of not reading his letter to the meeting, forgetting that he had addressed it only to Bro. Nisbet; I wish, says he, to express my regret for this mistake and to exonerate Bro. Nesbit from all blame, but I do not wish to retract my letter.

LONDON. - We hear through Brother Farmer that Brother Watts has removed to Edmonton, some fifteen miles out of the city, and that he was trying to secure a suitable building for lectures and regular meetings, as the locality is good. He had been attending a Baptist chapel, and was just getting into a discussion with the minister, in the presence of his flock, on the subject of pious souls flying off to heaven at death, when one of the members interposed an objection, to this effect: It was quite indecent to be discussing such

subjects there, and ministers ought to be protected from all such attacks! This is sadly amusing. It seems to say that ministers are not able to protect themselves, but depend upon the laity for defence. We hope soon to hear that Brother Watts has found a place, and that, as we have no doubt he will, he is setting forth the gospel of the kingdom "none daring to make him afraid."

MUMBLES. - Bro. Handley, writing Aug. 24th., says, "I am thankful to say I am well, and that the word of the Lord is working among the people; but you will (D.V.) get an account in due time for the Lamp. I have baptized four since I have been here this time, and there are several desirous of taking the step when their knowledge of the truth will justify it. I am doing my best to instruct them." In allusion to our article on "The raising up of Pharaoh, and the hardening of his heart," he remarks, "I believe God raised up Pharaoh to a place of power: he was at that time a hard-hearted man. I also believe God hardened his heart; but, as his heart was hard when he was raised to power, it is reasonable to suppose it to have been softened, before it can be said God hardened it. Now, I think we only want to see what softened it, and then all is plain. God brought judgments upon him; this brought down his pride, or softened him. At his request, in answer to the prayers of Moses, God removed the judgments; thus the mercy of God was the means of his heart returning to its original hardness; so it may be said, in all truthfulness, God hardened his heart by removing that which had softened it." We hear again, through Bro. Farmer, that a certain "Adamite" had requested Bro. Handley to discuss with him, he undertaking to prove that Christ was full of sin. This challenge seems to have been given when it was known Bro. Handley was about to leave; but Bro. Handley, with his usual boldness and frankness, decided at once to stay a few days longer, but no more was heard of the proposed discussion!

SEPT. 12. - Bro. W. Clement sends the names of the persons baptized: Mrs. Eliza Lawe, sister in the flesh to Sister Charlotte Hayward; James Delve, junr., son of Brother Delve; Miss Caroline Smith, and Miss Fanny Lawe, daughter of Sister Lawe. The two last mentioned are the fruit of Sunday school labour. More are looked for soon.

NEATH. - The gospel spreads in this town. Another addition is reported in the person of Mrs. Bartlet. Bro. Handley's labours are highly appreciated.

NOTTINGHAM. - We have much pleasure in being able to present a very favourable report of the state of the ecclesia, as well as the prospects of the Truth in this town. The annual meeting was held in the Synagogue, on Wednesday, Sep. 9th., on which occasion tea was served in the school-room, on tables tastefully decorated with flowers by the sisters who had kindly undertaken the task of providing the refreshments and making the necessary arrangements. Between seventy and eighty brethren and sisters sat down, and partook of the good things provided, to which they did ample justice. Tea being over, the party adjourned to the large hall above, at eight o'clock, when the business part of the proceedings commenced, Bro. Turney presiding. After a short prayer and the singing of an anthem, with organ accompaniment, the report was read by Bro. Mycroft, the secretary. The financial statement showed a considerable increase in the weekly collection during the last three months. Further efforts, however, are still needed to meet the demands of enlarged operations in contemplation; and although the expenses, from a variety of causes, had been unavoidably great, a balance still remained in the hands of the treasurer. At the time of the controversy concerning the Christ, the number of members amounted to 152. At the division which resulted, 33 separated themselves. Since that time there have been 26 additions, of which number 20 have been admitted to fellowship by baptism in the usual way, the remaining 6 being removed from other places; and three have died, leaving the number at present on the books 130. It was agreed that, for the future, on the occasion of receiving a new brother or sister into fellowship, the 25th Anthem should be sung, commencing, "The Lord bless thee and keep thee," the words being taken from Numbers, vi. 24, 26. Two of the presiding brethren, who retired by rotation, were unanimously re-elected, as was also the secretary. The other business matters being satisfactorily disposed of, the proceedings were closed by singing and prayer. Beside the Nottingham brethren, there were also present, Bro. Turner, from Birmingham, and Bro. Swindell, from Halifax. Since our last report, the ecclesia has been cheered and refreshed by the visits of several brethren from a distance, on one occasion as many as six being present. The morning meetings for the breaking of bread, reading of the Scriptures, and mutual exhortation, are for the most part very well attended, and the brethren are very united and zealous in the work of contending for the Faith. The attendance of the public at the evening services is also gratifying, and is on the increase. -The following lectures have been delivered on the Sunday evenings to very attentive audiences: Aug. 23rd, "The two oaths of God and their application to ourselves," Bro. Clement, of Mumbles, who also gave a very practical exhortation at the meeting in the morning, basing his remarks on Tit. ii. 12, 13; Aug. 30th, "Paul's preaching at Thessalonica," Bro. Turner; Sep. 6th, "The Gospel in Isaiah," Bro. Swindell, of Halifax, who also exhorted the brethren the same morning from Rom. xii.; Sep. 13th "The grace of God

contrasted with ministerial grace,” Bro Turney. The Bible class held every Wednesday evening, for the purpose of more critically examining the Scriptures, and presided over alternately by Brethren Turney, Ellis, and Hayes, is found very conducive to a better understanding of the sacred text. The average attendance of members is about thirty-five. We have also the pleasure to report the obedience of Frederick Bates, aged 22, labourer, formerly Primitive Methodist.

STOURBRIDGE, AUG. 26, - You will be pleased to hear, writes Bro. H. Turney, that we have succeeded in getting a first-class place for the Truth here, namely, The Union Hall. It is the best public room in this district, fitted with every convenience, and capable of seating four hundred people. We enter at Michaelmas. I will give you particulars for opening lectures. The brethren are in high spirits. The meetings continue to be well attended. Brother E. Turney and Dr S. G. Hayes are invited to deliver the opening lectures at the new Hall on Sunday, Oct. 4th, Tuesday, the 6th, on which day there will be a tea party, and Sunday the 11th, when Dr Hayes will lecture. The gospel of the kingdom has more than held its own in Stourbridge. About four years ago Bro. E Turney delivered several lectures there, which was the beginning of the work, to large audiences. He spoke three nights consecutively, for two hours each night, except a few minutes; since that time the work has been sustained steadily by his younger brothers, H. and F. N. Turney, and now there is a considerable meeting of exemplary brethren. “Let brotherly love continue.”

EXTRACTS FROM FOREIGN LETTERS

HAMILTON, ONTARIO, Aug. 8. - Bro. Powel dates a long and interesting letter to us enclosing another good list of subscribers for the Lamp, and expressing his belief that all the Canadian readers will place their orders for Vol. 2. He also gives us several hints upon the kind of reading-matter desired. We thank Brother Powel sincerely for all this, as also for the great energy he has shewn in the circulation of the Lamp from the first. Bro. Powel says, “our meetings are tolerably well attended, and some have shewn an interest, as the following additions testify. Bro. W. Vassie, assisted by myself and several other brethren, I do not name, as all are in such unity of kindness that, sometimes, nearly the whole were gathered to participate in the joyful encouragement afforded by the introduction of a new witness into the Name which is ‘a strong tower.’ The names of those added to us are as follow: O. A. Boulton and wife, thirty-three and twenty-six years, formerly Universalists, from London, England; Walter Adams, late of Portsmouth, Eng., machinist, formerly Episcopalian, D. M’Claren, machinist, from Glasgow, formerly Presbyterian; James A. Duncan, farmer, and a fervent Methodist, superintendent of Sunday school, etc., J. W. L. Childs and wife, Wakefield. Eng., Episcopalian. Our number is 22. The statement in Christadelphian, is not correct; on that day more than half the ecclesia were absent. I am happy to say, and the brethren will bear me out, that we have a greater degree of unity in the faith than ever reached before, and we earnestly desire that those who differ for the time may be enlightened by the Lamp, and that division may be healed.” After mentioning remittances, etc., Brother Powel writes, “Strike out a little more, enlarge the circle of subjects; better enlarge the paper and raise the price: do it, Brothers Turney and Farmer, I beg of you for the Truth’s sake and this vast American people’s sake. Do it. They are the greatest paper-reading people of the age, and it will be a means of reaching the minds of many upon whom no impression can be made by ordinary lectures or conversation.”* In reply to all this, we say that in proportion to the increase of circulation we shall provide fresh matter and more of it. This will be done by an extra amount of small type, which, however, being very expensive, we are not at present able, at our very low charge, to largely increase. Let many more of our friends do for the Lamp what Brother Powel has already done in securing subscribers, and we would immediately pour out thousands a month. Bro. Powel makes some remarks on “Feet Washing.” He does not think with some that a literal example was intended, much less that it may be fulfilled “in blacking each other’s boots;” nor that it was merely a lesson in humility, but that it was rather symbolic of standing fast, having had the feet “shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace.” Hence it may be said, “how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of them that bring good tidings.” Again, “our feet shall within thy gates,” etc.

*Since this we have decided to enlarge the “Lamp.” - .Editor.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO. - I have succeeded in getting nine subscribers for the Lamp, which, with my own, make eleven. I have given away seventeen of the lectures on The Sacrifice of Christ, and feel well paid for the amount of bread cast upon the waters – it is returning every day. The twenty-eight copies of the discussion have been sent on the same mission. In many cases I have been offered payment, but decline. The truth is gaining ground . . . I trust you may be strengthened with all might in the inner man, and that our Lord may soon come to deliver us from the present state of things; and that we may be found

having our garments unspotted is the prayer of your brother in the only begotten Son of God, DAVID SHANKS.

A MURMUR OF DOUBT AND FEAR FROM AFAR.

LATELY there have reached us sundry communications touching baptism. A fear has arisen, and an assertion has been made: - a fear, that immersion into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit is not profitable; an assertion, that immersion into the name of Jesus is alone safe, and, of course, not the same as the other.

This is an old question. Two men, Theophanes and Eutychus, who lived about A.D. 375, raised this same question, though they worded it rather differently, affirming that to be baptized into the Trinity was not lawful, and that a man ought to be immersed into the death of Christ. Now, if we put instead of "the Trinity," "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," the matter stands the same. In a leaflet from New Zealand we have all the texts strung together where immersion into Christ is named; and in a letter on the subject the text in Matthew is disposed of by an unwarrantable attempt to change εἰς, into, for for, also to regard the passage as a prediction, not a command! A prediction of what? This is needless criticism and hurtful confusion. Are there three names in Matthew, or one? One, undoubtedly, and this one name - than which no other is under heaven for salvation - Jesus bears. It was needful, at first mention to point out that this was not Jesus' own proper title as a man, but that it was bestowed on Him by His Father who is the Holy Spirit; it is therefore, the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: and whoever is baptised into Jesus is baptised into this name, nor could anyone be baptised into this name who is ignorant of Jesus - Editor.