

The Christadelphian Lamp

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

Vol. 2.

JANUARY 1875

No. 3.

CONTENTS

Page 2.	The New Year	Editor
Page 2.	A Treatise on The Tow Sons of God	Editor
Page 5.	The Upper Fountain of Siloam	Gleaner
Page 6.	Decree of Expulsion Against The Pope	Masonic News
Page 6	Prophecies Concerning The Jew	Dean of Canterbury
Page 7.	The Buried City	Gleaner
Page 8.	God’s Son	Bro. John Coffman
Page 11.	A Summary of Bro. Coffman’s Argument	Editor
Page 11.	Bible Emblems No. 3	
Page 12.	Natural Picture	
Page 12.	Spiritual Picture	
Page 12.	Paul and His Brethren	Bro. William Ellis
Page 14.	How and What to Offer	The Rock
Page 15.	Anger	Editor
Page 17.	Threefold Baptism – Healing – New Tongues	Editor
Page 18.	Everlasting Burnings	Editor
Page 19.	Letters to The Editor	
Page 20.	The Children’s Columns	
	The Story of a Great Captain and a Little Girl	
	The Horse and The Ass	
Page 22.	Jerusalem from The Mount of Olives	Gleaner
Page 23.	The Wisdom of Egypt	
Page 23.	Intelligence - Inc. An Explanation and a Defence	Bro. J. Cameron

“For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace.” - Ephesians ii. 14, 15.

“It will be observed also that Paul speaks as though “the enmity” were in Christ’s flesh, for he says, “having abolished in His flesh the enmity.” But enmity in a literal sense, especially that which existed between Jews and Gentiles in consequence of “the law,” had no place in the flesh of Jesus. But how, some will ask, could that be abolished in His flesh which was not in it? As they also ask, How could sin be condemned in the flesh if there were no sin there? These questions are plausible, but shallow. A little reflection on the expressions will produce an appropriate answer. The text, like many more, needs some other words to be understood. For example, to preach the Kingdom of God means to preach the gospel of the Kingdom of God; where to complete the sense it is necessary to understand the phrase “the gospel of” to be intended. Even so in this case. “Having abolished in or by the slaying of His flesh the enmity;” in other words having fulfilled the law in all its requirement’s and taken it out of the way by nailing it to the cross, so that it may no longer be the cause of enmity between the two peoples – Jew and Gentile

THE NEW YEAR.

DEAR FRIENDS, - We wish you all a happy new year! During twelve months of unusual agitation you have neither deserted us nor the great cause of which it is our privilege to be the earnest though humble advocate. We feel as firm in this cause as at any former period of our life, nay, firmer; for as time rolls onward opportunity is afforded for the acquisition of clearer and more extended knowledge, and the mind, by reason of use, becomes better fitted both to receive and to impart.

Every year, while it strengthens our faith, brings us nearer to that grand consummation which is its object. In the language of the Apostle Paul, we may repeat, "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed." The new years come and glide stealthily away. Thus will He, for whom we ought all to be prepared and waiting, come in, thief-like, upon the world. As a ship suddenly appears above the horizon, or as the fair face of the moon is unveiled by the dispersing of the dark curtain of cloud, so will be the rising of Bethlehem's Star. When this occurs, shall we be troubled, or shall we be glad? Would a Divine messenger at dawn, or at eventide announcing the approach of his Lord and ours summoning us into His presence with all convenient speed, produce in our hearts terror or joy? Should we hasten with delight to meet our oft named Elder Brother, or should we be ready to cry in despair for the hills to hide us from His awful presence? Every man's conscience will return him an answer - we hope of peace.

While the Master tarries, let us remember the injunction "Occupy, till I come." "Let us not be weary in well doing." In due time we shall reap, if we faint not. The moral waste around us demands our utmost efforts. Few, indeed, care for the ancient faith. The multitudes love pleasure more than God. They are ashamed of religion, and of the name of the author of it. Here, then, is work for all who care for such work. It is written, "They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars for ever and ever." In making converts, let us endeavour to win them to the love and practice of holiness, not merely to implant new ideas and leave them in character unimproved. The best way to do this is to hunger and thirst after righteousness ourselves. Are we better than we were a year ago? Can we count any more of the fruits of the Spirit on the branches, or are there leaves only? As we said before, the conscience of each will reply.

We would conclude our friendly greeting with an admonition from the pen of the Apostle Peter: "Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind; be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ as obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to your former lusts in your ignorance, but as He who hath called you is holy so be ye holy in all manner of conversation. Because it is written, be ye holy, for I am holy," saith Jehovah. - EDITOR,

A TREATISE ON THE TWO SONS OF GOD.

(Continued from December 1874 page 9)

The Son of God before and after His Anointing. - The Enmity Slain.

IT has been alleged that the word christos signifies anointing spirit as well as a person anointed, therefore the Christ existed as a person distinct from the Father before Jesus was born, and in the conception of Jesus the anointing spirit, or christos, became the anointed One.

Let us take the statement about the import of the word christos first. It is said to denote both anointing and anointed; but there is no authority for this double meaning. The most part of our readers will understand the matter better by the forthcoming illustration. Anointing is the act of pouring oil upon; it is therefore a process, or a doing of something. Anointed is the act finished, and signifies that some

person or thing has had oil poured on him or it. This person or thing is then called the anointed; that is, the person or thing which has been poured upon. The word anointed therefore defines a certain person or thing, but the word anointing denotes the act of pouring, or that which is used, as the anointing oil. But if we say that christos, or anointed, means also the anointing (spirit), then we make out that the oil for anointing and the object anointed therewith are the same; which is to make out what is not true, but what is absurd.

Now, the term christos is a Greek word, and its meaning is anointed. If 'a' is prefixed it signifies an anointed one; if 'the' is prefixed, then it designates the anointed one, that is, some particular anointed one. When christos is joined to the name Jesus, it shews that Jesus was an anointed one; but when, as is the case in scripture, 'the' is put before it, then it defines that Jesus is the anointed one distinct from all others.

Inasmuch as no person can be styled an anointed one before his anointing has taken place, it follows that it would be incorrect so to describe anyone before that event, and the question to which that gives rise is this. When was Jesus anointed, or when did Jesus become the Christ? which is the same thing.

Herod enquired where the Christ should be born; but that comprises no more than where shall He be born, who is to be the Christ, or who is to be the anointed? In the same way it may be asked, where should the King of the Jews be born? Jesus is said to be born King of the Jews, but as a matter of fact, He is not King of the Jews yet, after the lapse of nearly two thousand years. When he takes His seat on the throne of His father David, and reigns over the house of Israel, then, and not till then, will He be in reality the King of the Jews. This is exactly the case with regard to His anointing. Peter says, "He was made both Lord and Christ;" but it is impossible that He could be Christ before He was made so, equally impossible is it that He was so before He was anointed. Jesus was born the Christ elect; He was born the King elect of the Jews and of the Gentiles; but He was neither born the Christ in fact, nor the King in fact, unless we can prove that He was anointed as soon as He was born, and that as soon as He was born He was reigning as a King. When a man is nominated a member of Parliament, when the election is over, and he has a majority of votes, he is not there and then actually a member of Parliament. He is a member elect, but not until he has entered the House and taken the oaths and his seat, is he a member in reality.

Jesus bears three titles - prophet, priest, and king. To these we may add a fourth, a sacrifice. Was He born a prophet; born a sacrifice; born a priest? No. Yet He was born each of these elect. He has become three of them in fact, namely, prophet, sacrifice, and priest, but not the fourth, for He is not yet a King. We now repeat the question: When was the Son of God anointed? If we answer at birth, where is the proof? Look a moment at Jesus as a Saviour. Was He born a Saviour, that is, was He a Saviour the moment He was born? His parents were commanded to name Him Jesus, "for He shall save His people from their sins." He was then born to be a saviour.

The testimony concerning His anointing is on this wise: after John had baptised Jesus, "one of the two which heard John speak, and followed him, was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother. He first findeth his brother Simon, and saith unto him, we have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, the Christ."

What was it that this one heard John speak? "And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from Heaven like a dove, and it abode on Him, and I knew him not: but He that sent me to baptise with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Spirit. And I saw and bare record that this is the Son of God." At this time then, according to John, the Son of God was anointed or "made Christ." The Spirit which John saw descending rested upon Him, and was the power of all His miracles. It remained with him until He was crucified; it returned to Him at His resurrection, and transformed His corruptible into an incorruptible body.

Again, "For of a truth, against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, were gathered together." Acts iv. 27. "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit, and with power;" x. 38. This is declared in the previous verse to be "after the baptism which John preached," so that the anointing of "the holy child" does not mean that Jesus was a child when He was anointed; and the text also shews that He did not require to be made holy by baptism, as some have said, for as a child He was holy, whereas at baptism "He began to be about 30 years old." This wonderful anointing was not to purify or cleanse, but to invest Him with almost boundless power. Before His anointing He had wrought no mighty work. The first display was on the third day after He was baptised, at the marriage feast at Cana of Galilee, where he turned about 18 firkins of water into good wine. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth His glory; and His disciples believed on Him."

Having proved that Jesus was not anointed before John baptised Him, we will anticipate an objection in this shape. If Jesus was not Christ before He was baptized, what difference was there between Him and

John, or any other man? Does not this idea somewhat lower Jesus? We answer there was a mighty difference, neither is Jesus degraded at all.

Jesus was the Son of God, not merely a son, for He was the only begotten; John was the son of Zacharias. John possessed the Spirit, yet he “did no miracle.” The prophets wrought many miracles; they had spirit powers; but what were they? Simply sons of men; slaves set in great authority. Their deeds had no redeeming force, nor could have had they been ever so much greater. Their works terminated with themselves; they had no power over death. Thus it was, and must be, with every servant; not so with the well beloved Son.

The Father educated the Son, and cherished Him. At an early age the child knew that He was “about His Father’s business.” But in all this there was no entrance into public life, no anointing for mighty acts. This was the school of probation for the after high official dignity. Jesus was the free born intended for the work of deliverance; prepared under Divine tuition for the ensuing scheme. He was the reality of the typical priest when clothed. Aaron as a private personage could not enter the holy, address Israel, receive offerings, etc. All this appertained to him as high priest, enrobed in garments of holiness and beauty. What He was thus adorned, Jesus became in Himself. The Jews could see Aaron’s robes, but they could not see the Spirit vestments enwrapping the Son of God. His deeds amazed and vexed them, but his aspect had nothing new or strange. Here was the enigma. Unable to trace His utterances and His works to the predictions of their prophets, and through them to the Eternal God, they beheld Him and spoke of Him as an ordinary man. Hence their opposition, and their questions, intelligible enough from their point of view. Thou art not 30 years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? He replied, I am before Abraham. Now identified with the Father; now one with Him; now no longer speaking of Himself; now thinking it no robbery to be equal with God, because the wondrous gifts had been bestowed not usurped, He said, I and my Father are one. I came down from Heaven. I am from above, ye are from beneath.

While enjoying all this, He was truly rich, not to allude to His future riches, but in temporals poor, without where to sleep. He must now consent to be stripped of his honour and emoluments. Once the mortal crowd fell back; once He glided through the savage mob and went His way. Now He must lay down His strength, consent to be shorn of the locks of power, led as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb. Voluntarily He becomes again the plain man Jesus of Nazareth, though begotten son of God. Once He was a helpless babe carried off in hasty flight by father and mother to escape the devouring sword; now He must consent to be cut off, give Himself a victim for others.

This done, He lay still in death, the dread silence of the tomb was not broken for three days. The poverty of the grave devoured Him. All this was for sinners! Early in the morning, before the sun had lit the sky with amber rays, while it was cold and “yet dark,” seraphic fire shone upon the rocky cave, the ponderous gate of stone moved lightly to omnipotence, and the murdered Son of God awoke to an eternal morning. He rose up painless and refreshed from three days’ dreamless sleep; emerged from the cave, left his angelic guards to answer the tearful women; walked leisurely in the garden of the kind rich man, and was mistaken for the gardener. What had He left behind! What was there not before! Who can word the thoughts and feelings of that first resurrection hour!

THE ENMITY SLAIN.

THE words which form the foundation of this article are written in Ephesians ii. 15, 16: - “Having abolished in His flesh the enmity - having slain the enmity.” That which “Paul calls “the enmity,” he, in the same place, explains to signify the Law of Moses, “even the law of commandments contained in ordinances.” Here is a somewhat singular title for a great and wise law, - “the enmity.” This word generally stands for a bad feeling, and as such is strongly denounced by the apostles. Paul styled the law “enmity” because it was the apparent occasion of enmity between Jews and Gentiles, not because there was anything really prejudicial in the law itself. No, “the law was holy, just and good.” This employment of one term for another, of a bad name, so to speak, for a good thing’, - because that good thing misused brings about what is bad, is similar to Paul’s use of the word “sin” when he means the desires that lead to sin.

It will be observed also that Paul speaks as though “the enmity” were in Christ’s flesh, for he says, “having abolished in His flesh the enmity.” But enmity in a literal sense, especially that which existed between Jews and Gentiles in consequence of “the law,” had no place in the flesh of Jesus. But how, some will ask, could that be abolished in His flesh which was not in it? As they also ask, How could sin be condemned in the flesh if there were no sin there? These questions are plausible, but shallow. A little reflection on the expressions will produce an appropriate answer. The text, like many more, needs some other words to be understood. For example, to preach the Kingdom of God means to preach the gospel of

the Kingdom of God; where to complete the sense it is necessary to understand the phrase "the gospel of" to be intended. Even so in this case. "Having abolished in or by the slaying of His flesh the enmity;" in other words having fulfilled the law in all its requirements and taken it out of the way by nailing it to the cross, so that it may no longer be the cause of enmity between the two peoples.

The slaying of the enmity had for its object the making "in Himself," i.e., Christ, "of twain," or of two branches of "the old man," "one new man, so making peace." This opens up to mankind a vast and glorious prospect; it declares the purpose of God through His Son to restore them into one family; to destroy all "enmity;" to establish "on earth peace and good will among men." To this end the Son of God suffered shame, spitting, murder, and was afterwards raised from the dead. It was as though all the malice and fury of human hearts were poured out upon His head, as though He consented to bear in His own body all the anguish of a wrangling, quarrelsome, sorrow-stricken world, on the condition that having "borne their griefs and carried their sorrows," they would give each other "the kiss of peace;" be "no longer twain," but "one new man," renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him.

The slaying of the enmity and the breaking down of the middle wall of partition were the results of one and the same great act - the voluntary death of "the just for the unjust." The design of the Deity was not then, nor is it now, really completed; but that which confirmed the promise of it was achieved. The Jew still stands aloof from the Gentile; he is as much apart as when "the middle wall" separated him from the Gentile in the temple of Jerusalem. He has yet to learn that some of the "heathen" have been grafted into the Israelitish olive tree, and he will be astonished to find that they stand equal in rank with the stars of his nation; he has yet to be taught, that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him." Acts x. 34, 35. And is not the Gentile also ignorant; is he not a stranger from the covenants of promises; an alien from the commonwealth of Israel; "without Christ, without hope, and without God in the world." This is, in a universal sense, beyond confutation. The current popular theology has no more relation to a future Israelitish government, with Jesus for its Prince, than had pagan idolatry, except in the matter of using Jesus' name. The hope of the one was almost identical with the hope of the other; - disembodied existence in perpetual delight, on some distant, unknown sphere! The anticipated occupation of pious pagans was very like that of millions of "good Christians," as vague as it could possibly be; supposed to consist in "gazing", sitting, and singing themselves away;" "losing themselves in Heaven above." And all this ethereal, flimsy, spiritual gauze has more charms than the prospect of ruling their fellow-creatures in righteousness, of which indisputably they have much need - they themselves being made immortal and tangible, like Christ when seen and handled after rising from the grave. What amazing folly! Had not the prophets and apostles so plainly foretold the infatuation it were past belief!

To be continued.

THE UPPER FOUNTAIN OF SILOAM.

SILOAM consists of two basins or fountains, the upper one of which is a fissure in the solid rock. A flight of steps leads down on the inside to the water, and close at hand, on the outside, is the reservoir. This seems to be generally acknowledged as

"Siloa's brook that flowed
Fast by the oracle of God."

The drawing of the water from Siloam in the Feast of Tabernacles (though no direction on the subject is to be found in the Mosaic Law) became a remarkable ceremonial in the latter ages of Judea. The priest, with his attendants received it from the fountain in a golden vessel, and then, returning to the Temple, mingled it with wine, and poured it on the altar. The origin of the custom has been the subject of much discussion among the rabbins, but it is generally supposed to have originated in the verse of Isaiah (xii. 3), "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation." Much exhibition of popular rejoicing, with sounding of trumpets and horns, accompanied this ceremony. The whole Feast of Tabernacles was peculiarly a display of popular exultation, as it occurred in the finest season of the year, after the gathering of all the harvests; was under tents and bowers, reminding the people of the happiest scenes of the national life and was typical of the period when earth is to be Paradise again, and Israel is to

be restored for ever. The water from Siloam was drawn on every day of the seven during which the feast continued. But the most solemn outpouring was on the last, the chief day of this memorable celebration. Our Lord refers to it as prefiguring the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (John vii. 39) - The Holy Land, illustrated by David Roberts, R.A., with Historical Descriptions by George Croly, LL.D. Vol. 1 - Gleaner.

DECREE OF EXPULSION AGAINST THE POPE.

AT the semi-annual meeting of the Grand Lodge of Masons, Scottish Rite of the Orient of Palermo, Italy, held in that city on the 27th of March, Mastai Ferreti was expelled from the Order for violating his vows and for perjury. Mastai Ferreti is no other person than Pius IX., Pope of Rome. The decree of the Lodge at Palermo is published in the official paper of the Order of Freemasons at Cologne, Germany, and dated March 27th. It is preceded by the minutes of the Lodge in which Mastai Ferreti, in 1842, was instituted into the Old Scottish Rite. The decree reads as follows: - A man named Mastai Ferreti, who received the baptism of Freemasonry, and solemnly pledged his love and fellowship, and who afterwards was crowned Pope and King under the title of Pio Nono, has now cursed his former brethren, and excommunicated all members of the Order of Freemasons. Therefore, said Mastai Ferreti is herewith, by decree of the Grand Lodge of the Orient at Palermo, expelled from the Order for perjury. The charges against Mastai Ferreti were first preferred in his Lodge at Palermo, in 1865, and notification and copy thereof sent to Rome, with a request to attend the Lodge for his vindication. To this the Pope made no reply, and for divers reasons the charges were not pressed, until the Pope urged the clergy of Brazil to aggressive measures against the Freemasons in that country.

Then the charges were pressed, and the second and third notifications sent, and, after a formal trial, a decree of expulsion was entered and caused to be published. The decree bears the signature of Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy and Grand Master of the Orient of Italy. - Masonic News.

PROPHECIES CONCERNING THE JEWS.

Is the restoration of the Jews to their own land, often spoken of by the prophets, to be understood literally or spiritually? The last paper closed with a sentence of Dr. Pusey, who says, "When all around is spiritual, there is no reason to take this alone as earthly. An earthly restoration to Canaan had no value, except as introductory to the spiritual." I know that I am getting upon debatable ground, but the truth can be best attained by frank discussion, and in what follows I express only the result of my own thought and inquiry on the subject. "When all around is spiritual there is no reason to take this (the restoration) alone as literal." But was not the captivity of the ten tribes literal? Had not their shaking, as in a sieve, to disperse them throughout all lands, an earthly fulfilment? And if the dispersion was literal, why not the restoration? To what purpose, too, we may ask, are the Jews preserved by so special a providence unto this day? I believe that there was a spiritual fulfilment in the founding the Christian Church. In it the fallen tabernacle of David was rebuilt, and in it the Messiah, David's son, reigns over the true spiritual Israel, formed both of the remnant of the twelve tribes, and of Edom, and of the Gentiles. But I also believe that, God has still a purpose for the Israelites, and that the mystery concerning them is not yet fulfilled (see Rom. xi 25, 26). And when nationally they shall return unto God, as St. Paul leads us to expect, and perform for the world that ministry which shall make their reception be unto us Gentiles like life from the dead, there is no reason why the Holy Land should be for ever trampled under-foot by the Turks and Arabs, but a Jewish kingdom may be established there, and the Israelites be no longer a name and a by-word, but take high rank again among the kingdoms of the world. When Israel is converted unto Christ, there must be a reversal of all those penalties to which it is now subject of having rejected Christ. And surely the reversal of these penalties must involve a restoration to its former high position. It may be, then, that as the first and foremost of Christian nations, Israel may inaugurate an era of peace and good will, when Christianity shall be in reality more like what it is now in principal; when therefore, "the great powers" of this world, recognising something better than the heathen law of might, shall waste their

strength no longer in standing armies to hold in check each other's rapacity, nor devour their own sons in the savagery of civil war; when, too, capital and labour shall no longer be engaged in a deadly struggle one against the other; but a worthier and nobler, and more religious civilization shall raise mankind to a higher standard than any to which it has hitherto attained. At all events the Jews, when converted, cannot continue to hold just the same position which they hold now and if their ingathering into Christ is to be so great a blessing to the Gentiles, may we not reasonably expect that it will be the beginning of still greater blessedness to themselves? This prediction of Amos is at present unfulfilled. But does this withdraw it from the general laws which we recognise in the interpretation of prophecy generally? We gather those laws from the consideration of fulfilled prophecies; and I venture to say that no law is more generally acknowledged than that prophecies have both a literal and spiritual fulfilment. Usually, too; the literal is the prior signification, and was all that was understood by the prophet's contemporaries. And in no case does the one necessarily exclude the other. I quite grant that there are no prophecies, like that of Ezekiel's temple, which, are mainly metaphorical, as is the corresponding prophecy in Rev. xxi. 10 - 27. I readily, also, grant that this prophecy of Amos has a spiritual fulfilment in the Christian Church; for I do not understand how the prophets could describe the Church except by metaphors and ideas drawn from their own time and country. But the question is, Does the spiritual render the literal fulfilment untenable? Are Gentile Christians to take such exclusive possession of prophecies made to Israel as to deny any interpretation of them except one limited to themselves? If so, you have one rule for the interpretation of unfulfilled, and another rule for the fulfilled prophecies. As I read the Bible, I cannot conceal from myself that I must do force to its language unless I still regard the Jews as a people who stand in a peculiar position towards God. For there are definite predictions which, if I interpret them in the same way as I do fulfilled prophecies, assign to them an important place in the future accomplishment of God's will, and special privileges as necessarily connected therewith. These predictions are not couched in metaphorical language, and often, as in this passage of Amos, form part of a prophecy of which the rest has been literally fulfilled; and I cannot admit that the secondary and spiritual, because it is the higher, excludes their primary and proper fulfilment. - Dean of Canterbury in Sunday at Home.

THE BURIED CITY.

Far away from the highways of modern commerce, and the tracks of ordinary travel, lay a city buried in the sandy earth of a half-desert Turkish province, with no certain trace of its place of sepulture. Vague tradition said that it was hidden somewhere near the river Tigris; but for a long series of ages its existence in the world was a mere name – a word. That name suggested the idea of an ancient capital of fabulous splendour and magnitude; a congregation of palaces and temples, encompassed by vast walls and ramparts, - of “the rejoicing city that dwelt carelessly; that said in her heart, I am, and there is none beside me;” and which was to become “a desolation and dry like a Wilderness.” (Zephaniah ii. 15, 13).

More than two thousand years had it lain in its unknown grave, when a French savant and a wandering English scholar sought the seat of the once powerful empire, and searching till they found the dead city, threw off its shroud of sand and ruin, and revealed once more to an astonished and curious world the temples, the palaces, and the idols; the representations of war and the chase, of the cruelties and luxuries of the ancient Assyrians. The Nineveh of Scripture, the Nineveh of the oldest historians, the Nineveh - twin sister of Babylon - glorying in pomp and power, all traces of which were believed to be gone; the Nineveh in which the captive tribes of Israel laboured and wept, and against which the words of prophecy had gone forth, was, after a sleep of twenty centuries, again brought to light. The proofs of ancient splendour were again beheld by living eyes, and by the skill of draughtsmen and the pen of antiquarian travellers, made known and preserved to the world.

The immense mounds of bricks and rubbish which marked the presumed sites of Babylon and Nineveh had been used as quarries by the inhabitants of the surrounding country from time immemorial, without disclosing to other eyes than those of the wild occupiers of the soil the monuments they must have served to support or cover.

A great many erroneous opinions (according to Botta) have been disseminated with regard to the actual conditions of the ruins of Nineveh: they have been represented as a mine in constant requisition for supplying bricks and stones for the creation of the houses of Mosul, and thus assimilated to the ruins of Babylon, which have for ages furnished the necessary building materials for the surrounding towns. “Such however,” says Botta, can scarcely have been the case at Nineveh at any period, and very certainly

it is not so in the present day. The reason is plain. All that exists of the ruins of the ancient city boundary walls, and mounds, is formed of bricks which were merely baked in the sun; these bricks have been reduced by age into an earthy state, and consequently cannot be used again. There can be no doubt but that in the construction of these ancient buildings more solid materials, such stones and kiln-burnt bricks, were sometimes employed, and this accounts for their being accidentally discovered; but, they were merely employed as accessories - the mass of the walls was composed of unburnt bricks. Thus, in this particular, there is not the least similarity between Nineveh and BabyIon; the ruins of the latter only offer an immense quantity of excellent bricks; they have, consequently, been capable of being used as quarries. But the masses of earth which are the only remains of Nineveh, could not be employed for a like purpose.

Among the remarkable discoveries made by Layard at Nimroud, was a vaulted chamber, built in the centre of a wall, nearly 50 feet in thickness, and about 15 feet beneath the surface of the ground. The dimensions of this vault were 10 feet in height by 10 feet in width, and the arch over it was formed of kiln-burnt bricks; but there was no apparent entrance, nor could Layard divine to what use it had been applied. The discovery, however, of so large an arch turned in baked bricks and built into the solid mass of the mound, is a convincing proof that the ancient Assyrians, like the ancient Egyptians, were acquainted with the principle of the arch, although they both evidently refrained from using it in their larger structures, or where the abutments were not secure, from a knowledge, as we are assured by this discreet use of it, of the inherent self-destroying principle of the arch. We could have wished that the discoverer had informed us whether the bricks were of the usual form, whether they were wedge-shaped, or whether, as in some Egyptian brick arches, pieces of tile were inserted to keep the bricks apart at the top.

Another curious discovery was, that tubular drain tiles were used for removing the rain water that fell through the openings in the roofs on to the pavements of the several apartments, and that there was under the pavement of the mound a main drain, the invert formed of kiln-burnt bricks, and the upper part covered with slabs and tiles.

He noticed, also, that a thin layer of bitumen passed under all the floors and slabs, to preserve them, doubtless, from the damp which would otherwise have arisen from the earth underneath.

The Tigris is navigated by means of rafts constructed of pieces of wood, which are supported by inflated skins. These rafts (which are called by the natives, kellek) are well adapted for descending the stream, which in summer is very shallow; but they are of no use for going up. When the rafts have arrived at Baghdad they are broken up, the wood sold, often at a profit, and the skins brought back to Mosul, to serve again for the same purpose. Such were the means that Botta successfully employed for transporting the sculptures down the river towards the sea - the rafts of the required solidity being secured by the use of timber of a large size cut in the mountains, and the number of skins proportioned to the dimensions of the raft.

At Havre, at the close of the year 1846, was landed the first collection of Assyrian antiquities that had ever been brought to Europe. They now form one of the greatest attractions in the noble museum of the Louvre. - Nineveh and its Palaces, by Joseph Bonomi, F.R.S.L., passim. - GLEANER.

GOD'S SON.

Adelina, Ogle Co., III., U. S. A., October 31st, 1874.

Dear Bro. Turney, - In reply to your short, but pointed observations on my last epistle, I now send you an article for publication, which, in connection with my last, I trust will meet the difficulty, and perhaps clear up some other points that may not have been understood. Praying for the welfare of the truth during the absence of the Master, and that we may be found faithful stewards by Him at His appearing.

Yours faithfully in the Christ, J. D. COFFMAN.

THERE is no subject in the Scriptures more calculated to excite the gratitude and admiration of the faithful saint than that love which the Creator has manifested for the creature, exhibited in the sending forth, and giving up for us, of His well-beloved, and only begotten Son, who came not "to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." We have often imagined what Abraham's feelings must have been when on the eve of offering up his Son Isaac. What a faith in God's promises and

power to perform them must he have had, to overcome the love for his child, and to willingly offer him up, through whom the seed was promised. No doubting, no questioning, simply a grand and childlike faith and obedience, which was abundantly confirmed, when a victim was provided, suitable for the occasion, as a substitute, pointing forward to the providing of another victim, (Gen. xxii. 13) even the "Lamb of God" - His well beloved Son - "that taketh away the sin of the world."

We have been told that this Son was a "Spirit-produced man," a "Spirit-moulded man," a "Spirit-guided man," for the purpose of proving Him - in the writer's estimation - something more than a "man!" But the question arises, was not Adam also a "Spirit-produced man," a "Spirit-moulded man," and even a "Spirit-guided man" - for he had the privilege of conversing with the Elohim, and it would seem, in the absence of actual experience, to be absolutely necessary that he should require their counsel, and instruction; so we may safely say that he was also a Spirit-guided," as well as a " Spirit-produced and moulded man," but with all this in view, could we with propriety class him above his descendants, and describe him as more than a "man"?

Why then is this unscriptural language used to describe him, when the scriptures supply a definition which is far more correct, and which overthrows the idea sought to be conveyed in the above language, that Jesus was made from Mary's substance, as Adam was from the dust of the ground. This erroneous idea maybe, and probably is, strengthened by an incorrect understanding of the following passage:

"God sent forth His Son made of a woman," Gal. iv. 4. This testimony informs us that He was "made of a woman," and not of dust; but elsewhere it is further declared how He was made of a woman in the plainest terms possible, and on those premises it is repeatedly stated He was "the begotten," and "only begotten," Son of God;" hence, though "made of a woman," the qualification is introduced which shews that it was by begettal, and not by creation in the literal sense as in Adam's case: the product, therefore, was necessarily nearer, and closer related to Deity, in the one case, than in the other. For this reason the Apostle John declares that "every one that loveth Him that begat, loveth Him also that is begotten of Him." 1 John v. 1. And Jesus also observed to the Jews: "If God were your Father ye would love me, for I proceeded forth, and came from Him." John viii. 42. A clearer perception and distinction between the begotten Son, and the created Son, must tend to a more exalted understanding of God's only true Son; and a hearty and conscientious acknowledgment of this difference, is the only antidote to mere-manism, and the only clue to an intelligent, as well as faithful acceptance and understanding of the hidden wisdom contained in the declarations of Jesus. Heavenly things are not, and cannot be, appreciated by the natural man, as witness the case of Nicodemus, to whom Jesus remarked, "If I have I told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" The Apostles themselves were not able to bear His "hard sayings," at the commencement of their career, as well as they could at a later date; and it may be very truly said, they never could have borne them at all, had they not possessed that Abrahamic disposition of mind, which leans on, and trusts in, what God has promised.

In my last article I contended that as Jesus was the Son of God; in fact His only Son by begettal; He therefore and consequently, partook of His Father's substance as all begotten children do. This will probably (as the Editor remarks) present an obstacle to many, who, knowing that Deity is deathless, cannot understand that His Son, possessing His Father's substance could die. In other words, Deity substance being out of Him who is deathless, therefore was deathless itself.

In the consideration of these premises the following universally recognised and scriptural facts, must not be forgotten: -

1st, The Christ was the begotten Son of God; and

2nd, That Christ died according to the Scriptures.

Jesus being truly the begotten Son of God, may it not be correctly affirmed that this is prima facie evidence and proof that He did inherit His Father's substance? In syllogistic form this may be more apparent thus: All begotten sons inherit their father's substance,

Jesus was a begotten Son. Therefore Jesus inherited His Father's substance.

Conclusion, He was something more than mere flesh.

But all this would be readily acknowledged, had Jesus not died; it is this fact which constitutes the difficulty, and the stumbling block, with most minds, until their attention is riveted to the very foundation of subject, viz.: that God's Son was a BEGOTTEN Son. No amount of argument can overthrow this fact, which must be received with all its true consequences, for though we may not always intelligently understand how death could be affirmed of the truly begotten Son of the Creator of the heaven and the earth, yet, with faith in His word, we may sincerely believe it. Deity personally, we are told, "only hath immortality," or deathlessness. We also understand that out of Him, that is, His substance, all things were made, both animate and inanimate, the former of which are born to live their allotted time, then die; from which it follows - and it certainly is not a very unreasonable conclusion - that Deity has power both to give

life, and also to take it away, and though in the creation of the animal world His substance or His spirit appears to have been changed, or modified, and hence more possible of death, yet who will be so rash as to affirm that Deity could not, with His own substance beget a Son, who should be made subject to death? It is merely a question of power and ability, which it ill becomes poor frail - (though sometimes presumptuous) - man to curtail or limit.

Take, for instance, the angels, who Jesus says, "cannot die any more." Why is this so? Is it because of His inability to control that of which He is the sole author, and the fountain? Or is it because His word is at stake, in having promised and then given them an unending life? The latter, unquestionably; because God could not break His word, nor alter the thing which had gone out of His lips. These illustrations may make the subject under contemplation somewhat clearer, and to the philosophical mind it may appear more reasonable, yet it is not our province to explain that which is not revealed, and therefore inexplicable; such as how spirit and flesh could combine, and how in the union of the two the spirit unannihilated which had been rich could take upon itself the "poverty" of our own frail nature; or how much, or how little spirit, or Deity substance, was required in the case; or how that which had been deathless could afterwards die, and therefore cease to be deathless, and then again could exclaim "I am the first and the last. I am He that liveth and was dead." Rev. i. 17, 18. These, and kindred questions, which are sometimes the offspring of honest-hearted minds, but more often the product of quibblers, devoid of faith, we cannot reveal, because God has not revealed them. It is sufficient for us to know that a child was conceived of, and begotten by, Holy Spirit, which, said Gabriel, should overshadow Mary, and THEREFORE the Holy Thing born of her, would be called the Son of God. Matt. i. 18, 20. Luke i. 35.

The information given to Mary by the angel Gabriel covers the whole ground in very few words, and it is not possible to appreciate the origin, or the greatness of God's Son, nor to understand His remarkable discourses, and paradoxical assertions, without giving it that serious and faithful consideration it is entitled to. If this is done, we shall be able to comprehend the hidden wisdom contained in the following declarations made by Himself: "I came down from heaven." John iii. 13. "I came out from God." xvii. 8; and still further, "What, and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?" vi. 62. We can also understand even how He could pray His Father to glorify Him with the glory He had with Him before the world was - xvii. 5. These passages, which to many are very obscure, will be found full of meaning, if we only acknowledge the legitimate effects of His conception and birth, which introduced into the world as a son - to quote the language of the Scriptures, as used by Dr. Thomas - "One who had been rich for countless ages. He who was rich, and who had said, "The earth is mine and the fulness thereof," and who, by coming into the world He had made (John i. 10) placed Himself in circumstances of extreme poverty, that we through His poverty "might be made rich."

An illustration has been used to explain some of the foregoing testimonies, which, though perhaps not perfect, yet may not be without some merit in making plain that which mere words might leave obscure. If we suppose a furnace of molten gold, established on the top of a high mountain, to represent Jehovah in heaven dwelling in light unapproachable, and full of glory; and a particle of the incandescent metal precipitated on to the plain below, where it envelopes itself in "dust and ashes," to represent His Son; and the ascension of the particle back to the furnace which originated it, to represent, His ascension and re-glorification, we can readily see how appropriate those assertions would be which were uttered by Him - "I came down from heaven" - would be strictly true; "I proceeded forth, and came from God," would be literally correct; "What, and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before." would have become an accomplished fact, and, with His origin and descent from heaven, literally fulfils this prediction. "I and my Father are one" does not refer to numbers, but to that substance which "came down" from God out of heaven, and afterwards ascended where it was before, thereby illustrating another great truth, which plainly demonstrates His equality with God, as the particle of gold is equal with the substance from which it originated. "Glorify thou me with the glory I had with thee before the world was," or before I came down and was born of a virgin in Judea, has its parallel in the glory of the molten gold, and the particle out of it, which had descended into the "dust and ashes" of Abrahamic nature on the plain below, and afterwards was re-glorified when it ascended again into the furnace, where it was before.

Whether these illustrations be accepted or not, His assertions and discourses still remain for our acceptance. They are not to be looked on simply as displays of rhetoric and devoid of any special meaning. On the contrary, they are full of truth and hidden wisdom. The agitation of them among his contemporaries only excited their indignation and wrath. In our contemplation of them, let us remember this fact, and never allow ourselves to be animated with the same feelings, lest we be found in fellowship with His murderers who, because He made Himself equal with God, accused Him of blasphemy and eventually caused His death. Heavenly things are always repulsive to the natural man, who is never in harmony with the Divine mind and therefore, cannot be expected to receive its teaching; hence their

violent and blasphemous opposition. We must never look to this “old man” for an exposition of the doctrine concerning God’s Son, but rather to His own disciples, who are exhorted to be “filled with the knowledge of His will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding,” and therefore better to understand His “hard sayings” which, when considered in connection with the testimony concerning His conception and birth, ought to, and shall find that they do give us a true solution of the great mystery of Godliness

– John D. Coffman.

A SUMMARY OF BROTHER J. D. COFFMAN’S ARGUMENT.

1. Jesus the Christ was the only begotten Son of God.
2. That His begetting was essentially different from the creation of Adam from the ground.
3. That this difference constituted a nearer relationship to God than was possessed by Adam or any of his descendants.
4. That this relationship, together with His missions, is the ground of the declared oneness and equality of Jesus with His Father.
5. That Jesus existed with His Father in the same sense that any other son exists with his father.
6. That He was, like all children, a partaker of His Father’s substance.
7. That this substance being Deity He, Jesus, partook of Deity, and is styled Deity.
8. That Deity, thus “took upon Himself the seed of Abraham,” and “appeared in the likeness of men.”
9. That the process of this operation is not explained by Scripture, nor need be attempted by man. It is a matter of simple belief, or faith.
10. That this view of Jesus differs from both Trinitarianism and Unitarianism doctrine concerning Him.
11. That two persons, either separate or united, existing before birth of Jesus, called Christ and God are not sustained by Scripture.
12. That the “mere-man” idea is false, because it denies Divine begetting.
13. That “the Spirit-produced,” “Spirit-moulded,” and “the Spirit-guided” theory, come far short of the truth, and leave Jesus, the second Adam, on a par with the first Adam in these particulars.

We have endeavoured to present the pith of Bro. Coffman’s several papers in a plain, clear manner, and as briefly as possible; and, while fully concurring in his argument for the literality of the Sonship of Jesus, we, with him, would impress upon our readers the importance of always discussing so exalted a subject in a proper spirit, lest haply we be found classed with the uproarious wranglers who persecuted “the Lord of Glory.” - Editor.

Bible Emblems, No. 3.

“And a man shall be as an hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.” - Isaiah xxxii. 2

A great deal of the force of this passage is lost to those who have not well considered what a terror the wind and the tempest are in Eastern countries. Everything is swept down by the force of the storm and the wind is often such that unless a hiding-place is secured in time, sudden destruction is the inevitable result of exposure. So too the want of water is another thing to be greatly dreaded in the East, and many time a time a whole caravan has fallen a prey to the dreadful foe, thirst-fever. To those acquainted with the climate of land between 30 and 35 only N. of the Equator, the verse, “So that the sun shall not smite thee by day neither the moon by night,” can be fully appreciated. They will also appreciate the worth of a rock so large, as, not only to shade half but the whole of the body, in such a weary land.

NATURAL PICTURE.

Hast thou crossed the sandy desert vast?
Hast thou felt the Simoom's deadly blast?
And known that if shelter were not nigh,
The only doom must be to die?
Oh, how anxiously did'st thou seek to find
A place to hide from the burning wind!
Has the tempest swept by thee in his might,
Hurling along in his awful flight,
Scattering destruction around and around,
Bringing all mighty things down to the ground?
Oh, tell me, then trav'ler, has thou not sighed,
For a covert safe, in which to bide?
Oh, hast thou traversed the weary plain?
The arid sands that have never known rain,
And felt the maddening desert thirst,
Of all the desert ills the worst?
What would'st thou have given in such a spot,
For rivers of water, ah, answer what?
When the burning sun has scorched thy brain,
And never a hope of cooling rain,
No leafy tree, no shadowy cloud,
To cheer with hope thy spirits bowed;
Oh, with what ecstasy would'st thou then see
A rock, a great rock, to shadow thee.

SPIRITUAL PICTURE.

And the race of men in Adam born,
Is like the traveller forlorn,
No refuge near, stern death in view,
Till God appoints a cov'nant new,
And sends His well beloved Son
To die for sins that man had done.
Oh, hide thee then in His righteousness, (2 Cor v. 21, Rom iv. 22.23)
Ask Him to cover thy nakedness, (Rom. iv. 7. 2 Cor. v. 3.)

Drink of the water of life, and live, (John iv. 14.)
Come to the shady rest He can give; (Matt. xi. 28.)
He is thy life, then will ye die, (Col. iii.4)
When He can every need supply? (1 Cor. iii. 22.23.)

PAUL AND HIS BRETHREN

“WELL, Paul, you are regarded as one who wrote some things which are hard to be understood, and one of these is, that flesh and blood is inherently full of sin.”

“You do, indeed, surprise me. How could such a construction be put upon anything I ever said or wrote? Have I not stated that sin is the transgression of law, and that where there is no law it is impossible for sin to be?”

“It is even so, Paul, but some of your brethren were never under law, and do not sufficiently weigh your words, and therefore, frequently construe your metaphorical meaning in the literal sense, which makes sad havoc of your reasoning.”

“I am very sorry to hear what you say, especially after having penned two long letters to my brethren, one to those in Galatia, another to those in Rome, who, like myself, were born under the law, but had been delivered from it by Jesus Christ. My object in writing these long letters was to set at rest certain foolish conclusions of some brethren in Judea, who misunderstood the law and the prophets, and taught that it was necessary for the brethren to be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses in order to be saved. These persons gave me great trouble. Although they understood not what they said, nor whereof they affirmed, they bewitched many with their talk about themselves and their superior understanding in comparison with my plain and contemptible speech. No; I never taught that sin was an inherent quality of flesh and blood. You know I have said that by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; anyone with ordinary discernment can see that; the man was in the world before he committed the act of disobedience. The order of events recorded is, 1st, man created very good; 2nd, he is placed under law; and, 3rd, he transgresses the law. To suppose that man could not have remained obedient, is to imply that he committed no sin, and that the Almighty Creator sentenced him to death for simply doing what he was created capable of, and under the necessity of doing. The man who can so read what is written must be indeed void of judgment. I have told you that sin is the transgression of law. I have also taught, and I know Jesus said the same, that whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. Now, you know that the first man performed an act of service to his own desires, in preference to the will of his Creator, who gave him his desires and knew best how to regulate them. On account of this act of service, the first man became a slave, and all his descendants have shared in his degradation, as they were all in his loins when the deed of service was performed. This condition I have properly designated being sold under sin. A slave may be such as the result of his father’s act as well as of his own; but the state of bondage formed cannot be undone by either father or son simply because it involves the death of both, death being the wages of sin. Have I not expressed myself fully in this matter in the exclamation, “Oh, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from this body of sin and death?”

“Yes, that is the confession I thought you would make, that your body is a body of sin, full of sin, in which there is no good thing.”

“Do not misunderstand me, I have said I was sold under sin. This sale took place before I was born, although I came to know of it, and was placed under a law which told of redemption by the Christ. I did not keep this law, but sold myself, so that I was truly in a wretched state, from which I could not deliver myself.”

“But are you not wretched now, Paul?”

“Again you surprise me. I rejoice in the Lord evermore, and exhort all my brethren to do the same. My state under the law before I knew Jesus Christ was a wretched one; but I thank God through Jesus Christ that He has delivered me from all things from which I could not be delivered by the Law of Moses. All things are become new, and all things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto Himself. I certainly am not wretched now, for there is no condemnation to me, nor to anyone who is in Christ Jesus, who walks not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit; the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. (Rom. viii. 1,2).”

“Have you not written that they that are in the flesh cannot please God?”

“I have. And do you not also see that no one is in the flesh and in the Spirit at the same time, in the sense in which I have used these words? To be in the flesh is to be an unenlightened son of Adam or a disobedient son of God. The first has not been set free from the condemnation he inherits from his father Adam; the second, though once set free by faith in Jesus Christ, has come under condemnation for walking according to the desires of his flesh, instead of according to the instructions of Him who is the Lord, the Spirit. Obedience to the thinkings or reasonings of the flesh terminates in death, while obedience to the thinkings and reasonings of God, or the Spirit, is life and peace. Now, the reasonings of the Spirit say that while we were without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly, and that as many as believed this and were baptized into Christ were baptized into His death. We, therefore, joined

the body of the Christ in the death state, and as He was raised from the dead by the glory or power of the Father, so we also have risen from the death state to walk with Him in newness of life. We have been planted in the likeness of His death, and have been raised up with and sit with Him in the heavenlies. This is our present state. The change of body will not effect any change of state as to character or standing. One who is not a son of God now by faith in Christ Jesus cannot attain to a change of body when He comes; but one may be in Christ now, and afterwards turn aside and fail to lay hold upon life. Those who turn aside are defined as being twice dead. This is a state impossible, unless the subjects of it have been made alive a second time. If made alive a second time they must be free from the first death. To die a second time is to transgress the law of Christ; in other words, to fall away. The punishment due to those who so transgress must not be confounded with the crime or cause. All the natural descendants of the first transgressor are related to his sin. On this account they are all dead in him before any one of them does either good in him before anyone of them or evil. This is the first death, or death in Adam. Jesus Christ, the second Adam, though in the nature of the first, was not a natural descendant from him, and, therefore, not related to the first death, not being related to the cause of that death. He, of His own free will, suffered the penalty due to the transgressor. After He had undertaken to die, the just for the unjust, death had a claim upon Him; but after having suffered that claim was set at rest. It was impossible for Him to be held in its grasp, because His submission to it was voluntary and not of necessity through related to the cause. Jesus Christ being set free from death by the Supreme Judge, as a matter of right, and because of His obedience unto death having become the possessor of the dead and the living, has sent forth the invitation to all the dead ones to come and take from the gift of life freely. The acceptance of the gift of life is symbolised in the act of immersion. The intelligent believer casts off the old or first Adam, and leaves him in the baptismal waters, and at the same time puts on the new or second Adam. This believer is no longer his own. He has of his own free will given up all property in himself, and confessed himself the property of his Lord, who gave Himself for him. While he lives and is obedient to the will of the Lord there is no condemnation to him, and when he dies he sleeps in Jesus, not in the first Adam.

Is this one a miserable sinner or a happy saint? Is he still under the law of sin and death, or under the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus? Does he only mentally serve the law of God, but really the law of sin? Does he thank God, who has promised to give deliverance from sin, or who has already given deliverance through Jesus Christ? Is he attempting to do what Jesus declared was impossible, or does he serve Him whose yoke is easy and whose burden is light?

“I speak as unto wise men. Judge ye what I say.”

WILLIAM ELLIS.

HOW AND WHAT TO OFFER.

THERE can be no doubt, and therefore no denial, of the sacrifices which Christians, whether clergy or laity, are called upon and should deem it a high and holy privilege to offer up. We are permitted - indeed, commanded - to present our bodies “a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is our reasonable service” (Rom. xii. 1). And there is another sort of sacrifice also mentioned in the New Testament, “the sacrifice of praise to God continually” (Heb. xiii. 15), and it is every way worthy of notice that this sacrifice is to be presented, not by the clergy, but by the Lord Jesus. “By Him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise,” are St. Paul’s words. There remains yet one other form of Christian sacrifice - the sacrifice of thanksgiving; to do good and to communicate [that is, to give of our money and our substance to those who are in need] forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.” Yes; an act of liberality, with a full perception of the sacrifice, is one of the noblest feelings of the heart, and we may safely practise it as often and as liberally as we please. But these sacrifices - self-control, praise, and thanks-giving - cannot take away sin. No act however generous, - no emotion however exalted, kind-hearted or sincere, can ever erase one single sin that human frailty has contracted. No sacrifice short of the blood of Jesus can wash away sin, and that sacrifice neither man, nor saint, nor angel, can dare to offer, without neutralizing the efficacy of Christ’s sole prerogative of Mediator, and denying the fundamental truth of the New Testament, which tells us in the plainest language that we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all” (Heb. x. 10.) “Once for all!” Hence every humble, contrite, sinner can joyfully say, “Whom have I in heaven but Thee, and there is none upon earth I would

desire besides Thee?" We want no priest but our Great High Priest, who is able and willing, and at all times ready, to save to the uttermost them who come unto God by Him. All human or angelic creatures, however exalted, fade away before His mediation; and in proportion as we see the largeness that is in Christ, in the same proportion shall we see the littleness of all besides.

- The Rock.

ANGER.

IN all religious societies where perfect freedom of speech exists, there is considerable danger of manifestations of anger; and upon no subject has anger risen to so high and disastrous a pitch as upon religious doctrine. The history of the Church is to a large extent a record of cursing and bitterness. "Holy men" have spent their time and strength in mutual and savage condemnation; adding disgrace unutterable by a profession of "pious zeal." We apprehend that anything we can say will be but weak and unattractive; still as it is our duty to exhort and to warn, we will not shrink from performing it with all good will.

In the present moral constitution of things, it seems almost impossible to achieve beneficial results without great risks and heavy loss. Against the advantages of freedom must be placed the vast expense of war, by which it has been obtained and preserved. But as a little oil judiciously cast will smooth the raging surf, so may a word in season moderate, if not destroy, the wild passions of the soul. No pen or pencil can overdraw the folly and the hideousness of human rage. It has been described as temporary insanity, and the description appears to be neither unreasonable nor unscriptural.

According to the inspired moralists, anger is a sign of folly and madness; it is indicative of the absence of a good understanding. "He that is slow to anger is of great understanding: but he that is hasty of spirit exalteth folly." Prov. xiv. 29. In another place Solomon writes, "A fool's wrath is presently known; but a prudent man covereth shame." xii. 16. In this wrathful state it is that "a fool speaks all his mind," excusing or justifying himself by what he styles "a full and frank expression." But such fulness and frankness the Divine Word declares to be folly. The characteristic of a wise man is a prudent reserve, which keeps something "in till afterwards." Another of the Divine moralists speaks on the subject thus: "For wrath killeth the foolish man, and envy (margin, indignation) slayeth the silly one." Job v. 2.

To the professor of Christianity who is in the frequent habit of giving rein to his temper, it would be very advantageous to remember that in the estimation of the most shining characters of his own profession he is written down "a fool;" catalogued "a silly one." He resembles a wind-bag distended beyond its proper limits, liable to sudden collapse and ignominious vacuity.

The philosophy of the Bible is analytical, probing to the very core, it descends to the roots of moral and social evils, and discovers the true causes of things. When it prescribes a remedy, we may, therefore, be sure that if properly applied it will be efficient. The disease styled anger is, however, well-nigh outside the Bible list of cures. "There is more hope of a fool," the Scripture says, "than of an angry man." Solomon was decidedly of opinion that the sole cause of anger is pride. "Only by pride cometh contention; but with the well advised is wisdom." Whoever shuts his ears to friendly counsels is branded with the mark of hateful pride, and runs imminent hazard of breaking his own neck.

In the vocabulary of Inspiration we find men and things described in strictly correct and strikingly expressive terms. Viewing "a silly one" of the angry type, Solomon says, "Proud and haughty scorner is his name." Here is a graphic portrait in four words, and the reader will soon find the original for himself. Such is the Spirit's title for all who "deal in the wrath of pride." Prov. xxi. 24., For his species there is but one place in the world, or sphere of action they inhabit – the highest twig of the top-most bough. Friendly rivalry is labelled "rank poison," and as to fraternal subjection, "no, not for an hour." But the Scripture saith, "in honour preferring one another." One of the effects of anger is to render the individual dangerous to society; to disqualify him for the friendship of rational beings. It unfits him to control either them or the lower animals. It warps his views of justice and mercy; it makes him fitful, harsh, loud, savage, cruel. After the first outburst we feel unsafe, and constantly imperilled. Like a smouldering volcano, he may at any moment be in a state of violent eruption, and, while fondly imagining ourselves in settled tranquillity, we are suddenly startled by loud explosions, terrified by the shaking of the ground beneath our feet, covered with dust and scoria, and may consider ourselves fortunate if we escape being consumed in the boiling flood. Like the fickle and dreadful mountain, he comes to find himself standing alone, deserted and solitary; his friends migrate to a safe distance, leaving him to burn, and smoke, and

blacken in his own extinction. "Make no friendship," saith the proverb, "with an angry man; and with a furious man thou shalt not go, lest thou learn his ways and get a snare to thy soul." xxii. 24, 25. "An angry man stirreth up strife, and furious man aboundeth in transgression. xxix. 22. Nor is the transgression diminished by the plea of holy zeal, and devotedness to Christ. Every savage prelate and man-torturer has excused himself on this ground.

After this it is hardly necessary to add that the Apostles place anger on the black list of "the works of the flesh," and strenuously warn the disciples to beware of it, both in themselves and in others. Paul styles it "the devil." "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking be put away from you with all malice." Anger is among those things for which "the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience," therefore, the saints - especially the leaders - are exhorted to "put them off," seeing they profess to have "put on the new man, which it renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him."

This being the case, it is manifest that destruction is the end of a passionate man, unless he reforms. Job, Solomon, and Christ declare this. The effect of anger on others is also calamitous. It is "as coals to burning coals, and wood to fire." Where it exists there can be no quiet, except for the timid and the ignorant. Abject submission and absolute silence alone can prevent disturbance, for the very nature of wrath is to "stir up strife;" and "the beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water." Yet no passion is so powerless as anger for the accomplishment of any good work. It can do nothing but hurt those who display it, and weaken their cause; and must always receive more injury than it inflicts.

To accomplish the suppression of anger is a great and noble achievement, and in the disciple of Christ will be attended with much lasting reward.

No victory can bring even more present satisfaction and advantage than this; but the grand result is, that it qualifies the warrior to govern others not only in this life, but in that future age, when the government of "the wise" as well as of the mighty, shall bless mankind.

We ought not to think that our formal acceptance of the gospel will secure to us that high estate. Nor is it alone the momentary change from flesh to spirit that is designed to fit the saints to rule the world in righteousness; that is rather the crown for all our previously acquired wisdom and prudence in the school of probation and mortality. Now, the cross; then, the crown. And no cross, no crown is a rule of Christian life to which there is no exception.

Everyone has some sin by which he is easily beset; but the sin of anger may almost be styled the common property of all men. It is catching, like fire among thorns, and every brother and sister - for there is no immunity for the fair - should be duly provided with an extinguisher and studiously learn how to use it. We may borrow a salutary lesson from the heathen Julius Caesar, who, it is said, accustomed himself to repeat the Roman alphabet before he suffered himself to answer any provocation, that his resentment might be calm and just. When the fire has got strong hold it is almost a hopeless task to attempt to put it out, but there are few cases in which an early and vigorous application of the hose-pipe will not bring its threatened ravages to a stand and quench the forked tongues of its exterminating wrath.

"He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city."

"A wise man feareth and departeth from evil; but the fool rageth and is confident." "He that hath knowledge spareth his words, and a man of understanding is of a cool spirit." "The discretion (margin prudence) of a man deferreth his anger, and it is his glory to pass over transgression." But the angry "servant of the Lord" is far from this. His anathemas flash out like lucifers on the slightest friction. "Whoso keepeth his mouth and his tongue, keepeth his soul from troubles." "He that hath no rule over his own spirit, is like a city that is broken down and without walls." He is deprived of security, and always exposed to attack. "Wrath and cruel anger is outrageous; but who is able to stand before envy."

The advice of the Apostle Paul is "Study to be quiet." More than once he impresses this upon the disciples of the Lord. Some are naturally quieter and more self-controlled than others but where nature lacks, a more assiduous cultivation is required. There is no vice or virtue that will not grow if regularly cultivated, and each individual must be his own husband-man, directed in the art by the Word of God, which is "sufficient for correction and for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, throughly, furnished unto every good work."

To be quiet, in the Scripture sense, is no mean or trifling acquisition. The disciple of the Lord is peculiarly exposed to trying circumstances. He is not the child of licence, but the child of law and, as a brother of the "Prince of Peace," a high, dignified behaviour, tempered by true humility and meekness, should distinguish him from the children of the flesh. "To be quiet" under trial is his part; remembering his Master, who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; and when he suffered threatened not; but "committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously." This mildness is no wise incompatible with

vigorous action and bold defence of the right; but such defence and activity are all the more effective if free from outbursts of passion. Anger and innocence are not impossible, but the instances are few in which they are united. The Apostle says, "Be ye angry and sin not." Boothroyd translates the passage, "If ye be angry, sin not," otherwise, he thinks, the words appear to make Paul give a command to be angry. We think the whole context is a strong exhortation against anger, implying the existence of it among the disciples at Ephesus. If the text be read as a question, instead of a command, would it not sound more reasonable? Such alternative readings are, by some critics, suggested in other difficult texts. Anger is not a crime in itself; but it is a passion not easy to keep within reasonable bounds. It were superfluous to adduce the examples in which God displays it. There are several among Bible characters; such as Paul's anger against Peter, for dissembling before the Gentiles. Gal. ii. 11, 14. His anger at the High Priest, "who ordered the officer to strike him on the mouth. Acts xxiii, 2, 3. And here, it would seem, Paul was off his guard; afterwards checking himself. There are also several occasions on which "the very meek man," Moses, was angry, not without sufficient cause; for instance, at Aaron's making the golden calf. But it does not appear that he behaved improperly. Numbers xxxi. 14, which records the preservation of spoil and captives by Moses' captains, from the defeated Midianites, furnishes one. Another is found in the case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram offering strange fire, when the "prophet" invoked the Almighty, saying, "Respect not Thou their offering," xvi. 15. Jacob's anger because Laban pursued him, does not look at all unreasonable. The great danger lies in the display of anger without sufficient ground, or, indeed, "without a cause." This was most, severely reprimanded by Christ. Let us beware. - EDITOR.

THREEFOLD BAPTISM - HEALING - NEW TONGUES.

The above heads are furnished by the last number of the Marturion, from which we learn that a great change has taken place among certain professors of the faith at Listowel and elsewhere. The story of the recent discovery of "the old paths" is told with much earnestness; and as evidence of the infallible accuracy of the newly-found truth, the case of a lady is mentioned, who broke her thigh and who, after medical aid had been pronounced impossible, was "healed" through prayer, anointing with oil, and the imposition of hands. Another remarkable proof that the Spirit has been vouchsafed to the Listowel reformers is, that a certain Swedish brother can, and does, without previous knowledge, hold forth in "new tongues," discoursing occasionally in Chinese. As far as we are at present able to judge, it appears that all these mighty works have immediately followed a threefold immersion. The persons in question had repeatedly wondered why the Spirit was not now given; they had been baptised by means of a single dip, but even this was wrongly executed, - the subject being put under the water on his or her back, instead of on the face. Still one dip even face first, it is now confessed, would not have resulted in power to set a thigh bone or to speak Chinese. Ever since this happy change came over the ex-editor of the Marturion, and about a score of his friends, they have felt exceedingly joyful. They have freely indulged in holy kissing; have sometimes doffed shoes and stockings, and fallen to in good earnest washing one another's feet: this performance, we can imagine, might in several cases be highly beneficial; but from a sanitary point of view merely, the effect would have been quite as good if each had washed his own. Then there has been very much singing; at times in "new tongues;" and to leave no doubt on this matter, it is said, that the speakers have been visited by gentlemen acquainted with some of the languages spoken, who have allowed the genuineness of the thing. A professor of Greek, for instance, who, after studying the language for fifty years, owns that there is much still to learn, might, indeed, feel envious in witnessing a display like this, accomplished without any mental labour; acquired by three plunges face downwards in a bath.

But let this outline suffice, lest we should be censured for treating a solemn subject with reprehensible levity. We now propose to look at the matter in the light of critical common sense. How do these wonderworkers know that they are not quite mistaken as to the source of their novel healing art? They tell us that they were formerly ignorant of the proper method of administering baptism; that they were not desiring spiritual gifts; but as soon as some "brother" pointed out their blindness and nakedness; and reminded them that spiritual gifts could be had for the asking, they at once embraced the preferred blessings, and were dipped three times into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. They were then "filled with spirit," or "baptized with spirit." They do not mention "fire," though of this in a figurative sense there seems to be no lack at present.

What will our well-meaning friends think if we refer them to cases – of which there have been very many - where persons, who have not been immersed once, to say nothing of three times face first, have done similar things to those they claim to be the fruit of the spirit? We could cite astonishing instances of magnetic cures, that is, cures of men and animals, by the exertion of will-power. In the sect known in this country as “the Peculiar People,” no man, we believe, is permitted to become an elder who does not possess the gift of healing. Among these people the almost dead have been raised to health; broken limbs have been set and made strong in a few hours; and what with the credulous would easily pass for miracles, has been done again and again. Was all this the effect of trine immersion? Nonsense. “The Peculiarists” do not practise this rite.

But in support of threefold baptism, our friends quote ecclesiastical history. They ask why this mode of administering the ordinance was not questioned from the days of the Apostles until early in the fourth century? We reply that, no matter what ecclesiastical history may say, there is no proof in the New Testament of such a usage. The canons of the church, are they infallible? Bishop Beveridge attaches something like apostolical authority to the 50th canon, in which trine-immersion is spoken of; but who was Beveridge in such a question as this? Was Jesus dipped three times by John? The fact is we have no allusion to this sort of baptism till the second century, and Marcion, whom Polycarp saluted as the Devil’s eldest son, is the representative of it. Tertullian refuted Marcion’s doctrines, trine-immersion, as well as the rest. What is there necessary to be observed by the disciple of Christ that is not specified in the New Testament? But among all the things enumerated, three-fold baptism is conspicuous by its absence. The proper mode of baptising was very early disputed in the church. Some contended that it ought to be into the death of Christ only: pretending that it was one thing to be baptized into the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and quite another to baptize into Christ’s death. But to go lengthily into these matters is not our object just now. We have said sufficient to show that the so-called gifts of the spirit have no more right to be vaunted as such than have the cures of a professed magnetizer or mesmerist. And as for their being obtained by three dips, surely our friends will soon repent of their words. With respect to Marcion, the father of this rite, we have no very flattering account of him. “This heresiarch was of Sinope, in Paphlagonia, and in his younger years made profession of the monastic life. Being convicted of criminal converse with a woman, he was expelled the church by his father, who was a bishop. After this he went to Rome, where, being denied ecclesiastical communion, he embraced the heresy of Cerdon, to which he added new opinions of his own. He held, with Cerdon and others, two principles - a good and a bad. Origen affirms that he held there was a God of the Jews, a God of the Christians, and a God of the Gentiles. He denied the resurrection of the body, and condemned marriage. Marcion taught that Christ, when He descended into hell, discharged Cain, the Sodomites, and other impious wretches, out of that place of torment; but left the Patriarchs, Prophets, and other just men where he found them. He rejected all the Old Testament, and received only part of Luke’s gospel, and ten of Paul’s epistles in the New. The sect of the Marcionites spread, by degrees, over the greater part of the world. Marcion had proselytes in Rome, and Italy, in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria, and many other countries. This heresy lasted a considerable time, for, in the year 326, Constantine the Great published an edict against the Marcionites, and Theodoret, bishop of Cyprus, converted above ten thousand of them in 423.

We hope these people, so long silent, are not being resuscitated at Listowel.

EDITOR.

EVERLASTING BURNINGS.

THESE words occur in Isaiah, xxxiii. 14. We will quote the passage, “The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings? He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil; he shall dwell on high: his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks; bread shall be given him, his waters shall be sure” (v. 14.-16.)

Before this passage can be understood it is necessary to explain, in harmony with other portions of scripture which are undoubtedly easy to comprehend, the signification of the phrase “everlasting burnings.” If we retain one of the original expressions, that rendered “everlasting,” and enquire into the import of that Hebrew word, it will help us very much to elucidate our text. The word we refer to is

Olahm, and the “burnings” are the burnings of Olahm.” But what is this Olahm? It is of frequent occurrence in the Hebrew Bible, and is used for a short or a long period of time, and also for eternity. It sometimes stands for a term of no more than twenty or twenty-five years, as in the case of the Levitical priests, who held office from twenty-five or thirty until fifty years old. The meaning, therefore, of Olahm is an age of various duration, or, as we said before, eternity. In the next place what are the “burnings” of which the prophet speaks? It will be noticed that “sinners” and “hypocrites” are afraid of them; they cannot endure them, and when they burst forth it will be to their “surprise” and dismay. On the other hand it is declared of the righteous that “that they shall dwell with the burnings of Olahm.” The fact is, as may be seen from other passages, that the righteous - the immortalized believers of the Gospel - will be the actors in “the burnings of Olahm,” or as we read in Psalm cxlix., “the saints” shall “execute the judgment written.” When Christ comes to judge the world it will be the Olahm, or age pre-appointed for that great and dreadful work; it will be a season of fiery trial, in which the wicked will be “burnt up,” neither, “root nor branch” remaining. This burning wrath of Christ and the Saints against a wicked world is compared by Daniel to “a fiery stream” issuing from before the throne of the “Ancient of days.” The prophet observes also that “thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him.” David, in like manner, describes the coming of the Lord as a tempest accompanied with lightning and thunder. “Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him.” The Apostles, too, picture Christ as being “revealed” in “flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel.” These and other similar passages show us what is to be understood by “burnings of Olahm.” They explain them to mean the judgments of God executed by His Son and those who shall be with Him. The work is indeed fearful and terrible, yet it is also honourable, for David says, “this honour have all his saints;” to bind wicked “kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron.”

But this conclusion is very different from that to which we are led by popular ideas of hell. According to those assumptions it is the wicked who are to “dwell with everlasting burnings,” not the righteous. This erroneous opinion arises from ignorance of what is really intended by “everlasting burnings.” If everlasting burning are the same as the hell fire of general belief then it would appear that the righteous get into the wrong place; into the very place in fact allotted to the wicked! Such is the confusion and mischief resulting from wrong views upon this subject.

- EDITOR.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

5, Park-street, Nottingham, October 26th, 1874.

MR. TURNEY - Dear Sir, Having received a copy of the Christadelphian Lamp for November, I now enclose 6s. per P.O.O., the yearly subscription for the same. I beg to say that I consider the Lamp a very useful publication, and calculated to enlighten inquiring minds respecting Scripture truths, and sincerely hope it will meet with the success it deserves. I can assure you that its appearance (monthly) will receive a hearty welcome at 6, Park-Street, by yours truly, - JOHN SMITH.

Kilbarchan, October 25, 1874.

MR. TURNEY, - Dear and Respected Brother, - We would feel very much obliged to you if you would be so good as to give us your mind on 2nd Samuel, xxiv. ; 1st Chronicles, xxi. 1; also Job ii. 1-7, in relation to Satan. We would not trouble you, knowing your time is precious, but we sometimes meet with opponents, and they have given us these passages, and we cannot reply satisfactorily to them. Your Lamp has enlightened us on many subjects, and, most of all, concerning our dear Lord Jesus the Christ. We rejoice in Him as holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. Oh, to behold that dear face, which was marred more than any man's, and to hear from His gracious lips, “Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world!” - words which will cause a thrill of joy to pass through us, and permeate our whole being to countless ages. - C. SPENCE.

The word Satan is Hebrew, not English, and means adversary. Anything or person, whether human or Divine, that is adverse to any other thing or person is a Satan. Hence, God Himself sometimes plays this part. He was a Satan against David and against Israel. They deserved punishment, and God made

Himself adverse to them in suggesting to David the idea of numbering them. These remarks apply to the passage in Samuel, and to that in Chronicles also. They both relate to one circumstance. With regard to Job ii. 1-7, it will be seen by reference to the nineteenth chapter that the calamities ascribed to Satan are said to be sent by God. This brings the case into a similar light to that of David and his people. In a word, all evil, as well as all good, comes from God. He is the creator of both. "I form the light, and create darkness. I make peace and create evil. I, the Lord, do all these things." Isaiah xlv. 17. This view of the matter excludes the notion of a Satan in the popular sense. Diabolism, advertised on the cover of the Lamp, examines every text of Scripture on the Devil, Satan, Hell, and Unclean Spirits. - EDITOR.

26, Westgate -Street, Ipswich. November 9th, 1874.

DEAR SIR, - We read in Deuteronomy xxxiv. 5, that Moses died and God buried him. And, if all persons remain in an unconscious state until the resurrection morn, how is the passage explained concerning the transfiguration of Christ, Luke ix. 30? Two men appeared, who were Moses and Elias, or Elijah. I can understand the latter, as he did not die; but the former I cannot. If you will give me an explanation in next month's Lamp, I shall be greatly obliged? I remain, Sir, yours faithfully, - GEO. H. HANSON.

To E. Turney, Esq.

There can be no doubt about the death of Moses; and when dead he would be like all other dead persons in respect, to consciousness, which means knowledge. "The dead know not anything." "There is no knowledge in the grave." - Ecc. ix. 5, 10. This being indisputable, unless we contradict the Scripture, there remains but two things by which to explain the passage in Luke. The first is that what occurred was, as regards Moses, a vision; the second, that Moses was raised from the dead. But neither view gives any countenance to a conscious existence in a middle state. If Moses were really on the mount of transfiguration, he must have been resurrected; if not, then what the disciples beheld was of the nature of a dream or vision of the night. The scene is called "The Vision." EDITOR.

THE CHILDREN'S COLUMNS.

With the idea of co-operating with Parents and Sunday School Teachers in the Scriptural education of children, it has been decided to allot a small space every month for that purpose. The services of several competent sisters have been volunteered; but it is at our peril to write their names. - EDITOR.

STORY OF A GREAT CAPTAIN, AND A LITTLE MAID.

My dear Children, - I want to tell you a story out of the Bible, and I am going to do so in such easy words that the youngest can understand. I think it is one which both boys and girls will like - the boys because it is about a great captain, who led many soldiers; and the girls, because it about a little girl, just about the same age and size as many of you who read this, at least we think so for the Bible says she was little maid, or girl.

I hope none of you think that the Bible is a great hard book, only meant for papas and mammas, and elderly people, who can use long words, for there are most delightful stories in it, and lots of pretty easy verses made up of such nice little easy words that they look as if they had been put there on purpose for children. Almost every day I tell a tale out of the Bible to a great many children, some only four years of age, and the little things are so fond of them, that as soon as I've finished one they would like me to begin another.

Well, we must begin the story. Perhaps you all know that a long time ago God led some people, whom He called Israelites, into a beautiful country. He loved the Israelites very much, and watched over them, and took care of them, just like a father loves his own family. So God called the Israelites His own children, and He called the land in which He placed them, the "Lord's land," or the "Holy land." It was often called Canaan, and sometimes the Land of Israel, because the children of Israel, or the Israelites, lived in it. God promised that sometime He would give the Israelites this land for their own, if they would try to love Him, and always obey Him, and never worship any other God. But I am sorry to tell you that

sometimes, when they saw the people of other countries praying to idols of gold, or silver, or stone, or wood, and living just as they liked, the Israelites forgot the true God, and did the same as these people; and then God would punish them by letting some soldiers come and fight against them. These soldiers would kill some of them, and take away the fine fat sheep and goats, and the camels, and the gold and silver into their own country. They would also take many of the people, whom they did not kill, to be their slaves.

Now, if you would ask your fathers or mothers to show you a picture or map of the Holy Land, you will see that there is a country just at the top or north of it, called Syria. At the time of the story there was a King of Syria, who had a great many soldiers. The captain of them was Naaman. Naaman was very brave, and had won many battles for the king, so the king loved him very much. Well, God allowed the King of Syria to send his soldiers into Canaan, and they fought the Israelites, and brought some of them away prisoners. Amongst them was a little girl, and she was given to the great captain's wife, to be her little maid servant. Now a sad thing happened to this brave captain. He was seized with a very dreadful disease called leprosy. We who live in England know but little of this horrible disease. Many of you have heard of small-pox, and leprosy is as bad. If people had it badly they had to go away from their families, and live quite by themselves. Then, if they were taking a walk, and saw someone coming along the same way, they had to cover up their faces and cry out very loudly, "Unclean! unclean!" so that the person who was coming might go out of the way, and not come near to catch the disease. All the clothes that the leper wore when he was ill had to be burnt, and before he could come back to live amongst the people, he had to go to the priest to let him see if he were quite well. Was it not a dreadful thing for this rich and mighty captain to become a leper? But you will see presently how much good God was going to make come out of this very sad affair, and then I hope you'll remember, if anything sad happens to you, that God is able to turn it into something that will do you good, and make you happier than you were before.

Well, now I have something most beautiful to tell you about that little maid who waited on Naaman's wife. You must remember she was not old, and she had been taken away from her home and her parents to be made a little servant. And what was worse, she was taken from the country where they knew the true God, to a land where they worshipped idols. This would, of course, make the little girl very unhappy at first. You may think that after a while she would forget all about the true God, and the holy men of God who taught the people in her own land. But the beautiful thing is that she remembered them, and talked about them too. There was one very holy man of God living in Canaan at this time. His name was Elisha, and the little maid must have loved him for she remembered him, and believed that God could give him power to cure Naaman. So one day she said to her mistress, "I wish my lord, or master, were with Elisha, for he could cure him." Now, I think, Naaman's wife must have been very fond of the little girl, for it was not the custom of people who lived in this part of the world to allow their servants to talk much to them. And the Easterns use their servants in the same way now. The servants stand by their masters or mistresses and watch their eyes. If the mistress wants anything, she looks at it, and the servant goes at once to it and brings it her. A real Eastern, who was born near the place where Naaman lived, showed us exactly how they make their servants bring them everything they want without speaking to them once all day. Sometimes they make signs with their hands in this way - if they want a book they will look at the servant to be sure if she is watching, then they will point to the place where she is to go, and put their hands together as if they were reading from them. You will see now what the verse means which says, "As the eyes of servants look unto the hands of their masters and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hands of her mistress, so our eyes wait upon the Lord our God," *Psi. cxxiii. 2*. Now, don't you think that this little maid loved God, and often thought of Him, when she remembered so well the holy man of God; and wasn't she a brave little girl not to be afraid of speaking about Him when she was among strangers who did not know or love him? Now, here are two very easy texts that I should like you to learn, and remember every time you think about this brave child: - "Deal courageously (which means act bravely or without fear) and the Lord shall be with the good." *2 Chron. six. 11*. "Even a child is known by his doing's." *Prov. xx. 11*

THE HORSE AND THE ASS.

My dear children, remember that every word of the Bible is true, and if you read anything that looks at first as if you could not believe it; wait a little while before you say so; read and think, and in time you will find out how it can be quite true. Time after time I will try to explain some little thing that looks difficult to understand at first. In *Prov. xxvi. and 3rd verse*, we find the words: - "A whip for the horse, and a bridle for the ass." Have you ever thought that they were strange words? for you know we must use

a bridle for our horse to keep it at all within bounds, and our ass is often so stupid, that if it were not touched up with the whip (I don't mean beaten cruelly), it would not move. Now, a man who had never been out of England, and who could not have read much, was silly enough to say that the Bible could not be true when it said such things. But in the East, where the Bible was written, the asses are much more lively than horses. Indeed they must whip the horses to make them go, and more than that, a gentleman, who had travelled a great deal in the East, told me that they are sometimes so very obstinate, that the only way of making them move is by lighting a small fire of sticks under them. This seems dreadfully cruel to us, but what are they to do when they want to get to their journey's end, and the animal will not move? The ass, on the contrary, is so full of spirit, that it takes the whole strength of its rider to keep it polite enough to carry him to his journey's end without rolling him down a rock or two, or pitching him innocently into the first brook that is deep enough to give him a nice bath.

JERUSALEM FROM THE MOUNT OF OLIVES.

OLIVET is a name connected with the most solemn remembrances of religion. The credulity of pilgrims or the artifices of monks may have done dishonour to the sanctity of Jerusalem; fiction has too often found sites for miracles, and legend has largely usurped the place of history; but nature remains: all the great features of the scene are unchangeable; and he who now explores the valleys or climbs the hills of this illustrious region, is secure that there, at least, he cannot be deceived. Every outline of those hills, every undulation of those valleys, has the matchless influence of reality. He feels that he is traversing the very ground which was traversed by those great agents of Providence, whose memory has given a character and an impulse to every succeeding period of mankind; that he stands where they taught, and suffered, and triumphed; that he looks on the landscape on which they so often gazed; and that he sees the same grandeur and beauty, the same wild majesty or cultured loveliness, which so often lifted their hearts in strains of holy exultation to the God and Father of nature and man. Olivet is memorable in the national annals as the first resting place of David, when he fled from the rebellion of Absalom. "And David went up by the ascent of Mount Olivet, and wept as he went up, and had his head covered, and he went barefoot; and all the people that was with him covered every man his head, and they went up, weeping as they went up." (2 Samuel xv. 30). But, to us it has still more solemn recollections. No portion of Palestine was more hallowed by the frequency of our Lord's presence, and the events of his closing life, than the region of Olivet. To meditate, to pray, and to prophesy, He "went, as he was wont, to the Mount of Olives." From its slope He uttered the great prediction of the calamities of the siege, and the fall of the people; there He underwent that most fearful and profound sorrow which commenced his sufferings; there, finally, He met his disciples before He ascended to heaven and there the world shall yet see a still more awful and astonishing scene. "His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east; and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north and half of it toward the south. And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains - - - and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee." (Zechariah xiv. 4,5). At the foot of the Mount, and between it and the brook Kedron, is the "Garden of Gethsemane." General consent adopts this as the scene of the "Agony." It is still an olive ground, with many neglected trees widely scattered over the slope of the hill; but the spot especially sacred in the estimation of the pilgrims is a space of fifty-seven yards square with a low stone enclosure, containing eight large olive trees, apparently of great antiquity. "They are," says a recent traveller, still in a sort of ruined cultivation; the fences broken down and the trees decaying. Here no violence, or none that merits notice, has been done to the simplicity of the scene." (Jowett's Researches. P.253). The view is extensive beyond the city, commanding the plain of Jericho, and, on the east, the valley of the Jordan, and a portion of the Dead Sea. On the summit of the mount is an Arab village, with a stone building in its centre, which is said to mark the spot of the "Ascension." But our Lord ascended from Bethany.

"The Holy Land, illustrated by David Roberts, B.A., with historical descriptions by George Croly, LL.D. Vol. I. - GLEANER.

THE WISDOM OF EGYPT.

GREAT must have been the wisdom of that ancient land, for it is spoken of in the book of sacred truth – the volume of wisdom. But of the numerous parchments, and vast libraries, alas! but few pages have come down to us. There are three or four manuscripts on papyrus still extant, that were taken from the tombs; they are of great interest to all, and especially to the biblical student, as they are corroborative of portions of Bible history. The most interesting and the largest of these is now in the British Museum. Besides these, we have a few pages of Manetho, the Egyptian historian. Of the forty-two sacred books they once possessed, but one remains; it was called the book of the dead; contains a description of the trial of a departed soul. It is represented on its long journey, as occupied with prayers and confessions. Forty-two gods occupy the judgment seat. Osiris presides; and before him are the scales, in one of which the statue of perfect Justice is placed, in the other the heart of the deceased. The soul of the dead stands watching the balance, while Horus examines the balance indicating which way the beam preponderates; and Thoth, the Justifier, records the sentence. If this is favourable, the soul receives a mark or seal “Justified.”

Some of the ancient, inspired writers appear to have been familiar with this book. Lycurgus went to Egypt to learn, and there many a sage of Greece learned his first lessons in wisdom and philosophy. Classic limners, sculptors, and historians, searched for knowledge in the land of the lotus.

The land of the wonderful Pyramids, and mystic hieroglyphics is the birth-place of the alphabet. There the wonders of astronomy were studied; and was not that little apartment that crowns yon colossal temple an observatory from whence the heavens were swept by optical instruments? In the arts, their knowledge was great. The manufacture of glass was well understood; they made coffins. Paintings have been discovered, showing machinery whose motive power couldn't have been anything else but steam. An obelisk brought from Egypt by Napoleon the Great, and erected at Paris, was found to have been polished by the sand-blast process. They made steel, and were skilled in metallurgy. Their paintings still remain, and are wonderful for beauty, though thousands of years have elapsed since those strokes were made. In the science of medicine they were proficient; in embalming they could see the effects of disease. To this day the characters used by apothecaries to denote drachms and grains are Egyptian ciphers as adopted by the Arabs.

INTELLIGENCE.

AN EXPLANATION AND A DEFENCE.

I have to thank you for inserting my former letter on “Mr. Roberts and the Dowieites.” Would you permit me once more to refer to the same article in the *Christadelphian*; on one or two points which concern the brotherhood at large, of whatever name and denomination? The article opens thus: - “Nearly ten years ago there was a withdrawal of the faithful friends of the truth from a class who for the sake of distinction have been known as Dowieites, from the name of a leading man among them. The association existing between the two up to that time was what might be called an accidental one, resulting from the first agitation of the truth in the country in 1849, which, presenting in its several aspects different attractions to different kinds of minds, drew them together on a crude and partial basis, and not as a community wholly devoted to the truth in all its parts and obligations, such as now exists.” “The first agitation of the truth in 1849” (which should, however, be 1848) points to the visit of our late brother, Dr. John Thomas, to Great Britain in June, 1848. “The association” of the brotherhood, down to “nearly ten years ago,” is said to have been “on a crude and partial basis.” Now, what are the facts? The entire brotherhood, including Dr Thomas and R. Roberts, were, down to 1864, practically and substantially at one as to the “One Faith” necessary to be believed in order to baptism. The best proof of this is that Dr Thomas and many others did not think it necessary to be re-baptized on any new basis. That that basis was comprehensive, well defined, and well understood, and its simplicity recognised and defended by the Doctor him-self, as well as by others, I shall show anon. In the meantime let it be distinctly understood that if the so-called crude and partial basis” of 1848-64 was insufficient for valid baptism, many have died unbaptised and many remain so to the present moment, who are fellow-worshippers at Birmingham. Dr. Thomas himself was, I presume, in the former class, as I have seen no evidence of his ever having renounced the position he held since his baptism in 1846. Possibly R. Roberts himself is in the latter, as well as many others that could be named. One would

think that the zeal for the truth, and love for the brotherhood so loudly professed by R. Roberts, would give their possessor no rest till every professed believer was put into a safe position by being baptised on a confession of “the truth in all its parts,” as contained in the thirty-five articles of the Birmingham creed, or withdraw from such as refuse. It rather seems to me that the charge of crudeness and partiality rests upon those who tolerate the fellowship of such as remain on the old basis while professing to hold and maintain the new. There seems to be a “crude and partial” morality here which one would think the anticipated Judgment Day, so much talked of, should have some influence in correcting. I have affirmed that, during the period referred to, the truth was held on a comprehensive, well-defined, and understood, yet simple basis, and, as such, was defended by Dr. Thomas and others. Now for the proof. On the 8th July, 1848, Dr. Thomas wrote a letter containing a categorical statement of what he believed and taught, consisting of sixteen articles, not to be used as a creed, but to correct misrepresentation; and this was published in the Gospel Banner for August, 1848, p. 225, the organ of Alex. Campbell’s Reformation at Nottingham. The statement is as follows: -

I). I believe and teach that the Scriptures of the Prophets and Apostles are of themselves able to make men wise unto salvation, and that whatever is not according to these ought not to be received there is nothing which can be shown to be taught here, but what I do and will receive it with all my heart.

II). I believe the promises made to the fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in their literal or grammatical import, and in the everlasting covenant made with David.

III). I believe in that kingdom spoken of by Daniel and the Prophets, which will soon be set up by the God of Heaven upon the ruins of all states and empires.

IV). I believe that the Son of Man is to possess this kingdom and the dominion of the globe; but that He was first to be a sufferer, become obedient unto death, rise from among the dead, lead captivity captive, sit at the right hand of the Ancient of Days, until the time comes to set up the kingdom; then come in power and great glory to rule men justly in the fear of the Lord,

V). I believe that Jesus of Nazareth is this prophetic sufferer and glorious King of men, the Son and Anointed One of God, and the Great Captain destined to lead many sons to glory.

VI). I believe that the Gospel comprehends the things concerning this promised kingdom, and not, or but and the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ.

VII). I believe that the obedience of the Gospel consists in a believer of the things indicated in No. 6, being immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that in submitting Himself to this act of faith, His faith, like Abraham’s, is counted to Him for righteousness, or remission of past sins. This I understand to be baptism for the remission of sins.

VIII). I believe that man is a sinner by constitution and by practice, and by both entitled only to the good and evil of the present state, to death and corruption.

IX). I believe that glory, honour, incorruptibility, and life are attributes of the Kingdom of God and not of sinful flesh * see footnote and that whosoever is accounted worthy of the Kingdom will receive them. Hence, they are set before us as matters of hope, and recompense of reward.

X). I believe that the promises are a part of the faith that justifies the obedient, as it is written “through the knowledge . . . are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises that by these ye might be partakers of the Divine Nature.” To obtain the Kingdom, a man must be a partaker of the Divine nature, or he cannot share with the model of that nature – even Jesus - in the inheritance. One of the distinguishing features of this nature is justice. “Why do ye not of yourselves judge that which is right?”

XI). I believe in the resurrection of the righteous to possess the Kingdom, and of the unrighteous, ** see footnote 1,000 years after, to judgment, etc.

XII). I believe that Jesus will come soon in propria persona to the salvation of those “who look for Him,” and to raise His saints, and to “take away the dominion” of the nations from their present rulers.

XIII). I believe the saints shall rule the world for 1,000 years.

XIV). I believe more about the present eventful times than I can write now.

XV). I believe in that repentance which results from the belief of the exceeding great and precious promises, which is essentially the disposition of the fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and known by the fruit of the spirit that it is the goodness of God, and not terror, that leads men to repentance.

XVI). I believe it is the duty and privilege of the faithful to “contend earnestly for the faith originally delivered to the saints,” to meet every first day to break bread, for mutual edification, etc., and that the apostolic churches had a plurality of elders, etc.”

Footnotes: -

* ‘Sin’s flesh’ ~ ED.

** But the Doctor afterwards taught the resurrection and judgment of both at the appearing of Christ. ~ ED.

I leave your readers to judge whether this is open to the charge of being “crude and partial.” And yet this is substantially the basis upon which the brotherhood were drawn together, and upon which the so-called Dowieites stand practically to the present time. It will be observed that Article VII. affirms a principle, always held, and frequently enunciated by the brotherhood: namely, that baptism, to be of any avail, must be preceded by the One Faith on the part of those baptised; and, the other hand, that the One Faith, to be instrumental in sin-remission, must be followed by baptism. It is here the Birmingham Creed convicts Dr. Thomas and many others of being yet in their sins through defective faith at baptism.

In May, 1856, the Doctor wrote (Herald of the Kingdom of that date) “When I was immersed, in 1846, I could read Romans iv. as an account of what I believed and understood. I believed the same things Abraham believed, and other things the Apostles taught that he had not heard of; and I was, and continue to be, as fully persuaded of them as it was possible for him to be. Others there are among the living who doubtless can testify the same. Their numbers, however, in this dark and cloudy day, are not legion. Still, there are sufficient to stand shoulder to shoulder by Noah, and by their Abrahamic faith, to condemn the religious world for its unbelief. Hebrews xi. 7.”

Here Dr. Thomas, ten years after baptism in 1846, declares his adherence to the One Faith, as held in its simplicity prior to his baptism. This simplicity he often contended for in his various writings. Thus, in 1849; “There is no true religion without faith; nor any true faith without the belief of the truth. Now although a Scriptural faith is the scarcest thing among men it is exceedingly simple, and by no means a difficult thing to acquire, when it is sought for aright. Paul gives the best definition of faith extant. He says, “faith is a confident anticipation of things hoped for, a full persuasion of events not seen.” This is the faith without which, he tells us afterwards, God is not and cannot by any possibility be pleased. It is a faith which lays hold of the past and the future. The person who possesses it knows what is testified concerning Jesus by the Apostles, and is fully persuaded of its truth; he also knows the exceeding great and precious promises which God has made concerning things to come, and he confidently anticipates the literal fulfilment of them. Laying hold of these things with a firm faith, he acquires a mode of thinking and a disposition which are estimable in the sight of God: and, being like Abraham in these particulars, he is prepared by induction into Christ, to become a son of the Father of the faithful, and of the friend of God.” Elpis Israel, p. 145.

Again, four years later: - “No Church enlightened by the truth, was ever disrupted or divided by an earnest advocacy of the Gospel preached to Abraham, the millennium reign, the things of the Kingdom, or of life and incorruptibility only through the Gospel. A really Christian church rejoiceth in the truth, believing and hoping all things it contains. Not so mere ecclesiastical associations. These are averse to all things not dogmatized, in the confessions of their humanly authorized opinions. Mere Diana-worshippers, the craft-creed is glorified to the rejection of “the Word of God.” Herald of Kingdom, vol. III. p. 208.

Again, at greater length in 1856 Josedec, - But I cannot get over the difficulty that if all the Gospel is to be believed to qualify for immersion, in this day, at least, there would be none baptized or saved.

Elpis - That difficulty is obviated by the fact, that many do believe all the Gospel, and have been immersed in consequence. But, alas, what a generation must this be, that cannot attain to the belief of the whole Gospel before immersion! One would suppose that it was as difficult, as to commit the whole of Euclid to heart. Is there any difficulty in understanding, -

1). - That a kingdom once existed in the Holy Land, consisting of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, nationally organised under the Siniatic Constitution; whose royalty was forever established in the family of David, of the tribe of Judah; and the throne of the dominion inseparably attached to Jerusalem, as the everlasting capital of the Kingdom?

2). - That this kingdom, existed there for many centuries under the administration of men who, being mortal, left the Kingdom to other people?

3). - That this Kingdom and all pertaining to it was Jehovah’s, and therefore it is styled the Kingdom of God? And,

4). - That, though the country, the subjects, the capital, and the Heir of the Royal House of David, all existed, though widely separated, the kingdom and throne are abolished and trampled under foot?

Are these four points difficult to understand, and do they require a long, deep, and tedious search to discover?

Josedec. - By no means. They are obviously set forth in the Bible history of the Hebrew nation, so that he who runs may read and understand.

Elpis. - Exactly so; and he that has the information and believes it to be true has historical faith in the Kingdom of God. Now, I would like to know if it be more difficult to understand the following proposition -

THE KINGDOM WHICH FORMERLY EXISTED IN THE HOLY LAND GOD WILL AGAIN ESTABLISH THERE, UNDER A NEW AND BETTER CONSTITUTION.

Josedec.- It is not difficult to understand the affirmation of the proposition which is assuredly true, but biased by the general views of religion and the obstacles in the way, it is almost impossible for people to believe it.

Elpis. - Even, so: you admit its truth; and that, consequently it is revealed in the Bible, which reveals it with the plainness of history; but the difficulty lies in the little faith people have in what the Bible says of the future and the tenacity with which they hold on to their traditions.

... **Josedec** - The proposition you have stated is simple enough; but from what you have already said, I should conclude, that you would not be satisfied with the faith that comprehends no more as a qualification for baptism.

Elpis. - Truly not. But besides what it expresses, is it a long, abstruse, and difficult process, to come to the knowledge of "the Covenants of Promise in which that proposition takes root? The biographies of Abraham and David are fascinating stories; and cannot be attentively read without knowing all that those covenants decree."

After quoting the promises to Abraham, under four heads, he proceeds - "Here then are other four points set forth in Jehovah's Will and Testament to Abraham, and his seed, as federal persons. The whole Gospel of the Kingdom in an enigma is therein set forth; as

- 1). The great and mighty nation descended from Abraham; planted on the land of Canaan permanently - the Kingdom;
- 2). The seed represented by Isaac, as the fee simple proprietor of the country - its King.
- 3). The world of nations of which Abraham is father - the dominion.
- 4). The seed to be slain and rise again - the parable, or enigma.
- 5). At some time after His resurrection the seed to conquer His enemies - the second appearing.
- 6). All nations then to be blessed in Him - time when the Gospel takes effect.
- 7). All predicted on obedience - "because thou hast obeyed my voice."

Josedec. But even this amount of knowledge would not satisfy you. It is all very plain so far: but still you want more.

Elpis. Of course, all this little amount of knowledge believed, would leave a man's faith defective. He might believe all contained in the four historical points, and in the four covenant points, and his faith be no further in advance than the faith of John's disciples, who were familiar with the things adduced; a faith however, which, we know for certain, was not sufficient to make immersion the "One Baptism:" for in twelve cases the faith had to be perfected, and immersion to be repeated, to put the believers upon the true foundation. Acts xix. 1-7.

In reflecting upon the covenant made with Abraham, you would perhaps not readily determine, apart from the apostolic writings, whether Abraham's seed was to be merely a son of Abraham, or, son of Abraham and son of God: nor could it, by that covenant, be settled, in which family of the great and mighty the sceptre should be established. This made another covenant necessary - the everlasting covenant with David. This provided:

- 1). That his family should be the Royal House of Jehovah's Kingdom for ever.
- 2). That one of his sons should be resurrected or 'raised up' to sit upon His throne. Acts ii. 30.
- 3). That David's throne, thus occupied, should be established for evermore.
- 4). That said resurrected son of David should be Son of God: and,
- 5). That he should build a house for Jehovah.

Josedec. But in this summary of the whole Gospel, you have said nothing about the proposition, that 'Jesus is the Son of God:' what place does it occupy in the system of truth?

Elpis. You make it the system itself, as if there were nothing else proposed for faith . . .

This declaration, that 'Jesus is Christ the Son of the living God,' only excites in a cogitative and candid person the inquiry, 'What does Christ signify?' It certainly refers to a man, because it is in apposition with 'Son;' but why is this Son called Christ? Is it the name of His Father; and therefore a part of his own patronymic? . . .

In the Gospel system of truth this proposition occupies a very important place: for if Jesus be not the Christ and Son referred to in the covenants, then those covenants have never yet been brought into force; the Abrahamic covenant, has no sanctifying efficacy: there is no remission of sins through the name of Jehovah Elohainu; immersion is of no use. But Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; and therefore the foundation corner-stone of the whole gospel superstructure . . .

Now Jesus . . . commanded men to “seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness.” He did not say “seek first the righteousness of God and His Kingdom,” because the righteousness of God is only for those who have sought the Kingdom, and found it.

You see, then, the distinction between ‘His truth’ and ‘the truth as it is in Jesus.’ The prophets, and disciples of John the Baptist, believed the truth; while those taught by the Apostles believed it, ‘as it is in Jesus.’ – Herald of the Kingdom, vol. vi., pp. 130-133.

Notice, in last brief paragraph, a most important distinction, which is utterly opposed to what Roberts calls “the truth in all its parts,” as expressed in the thirty-five articles, and habitually termed “the truth.” This phrase is susceptible of expansion or contraction, and is therefore ambiguous. The more apostolic nomenclature is “The Gospel,” “The Faith,” “One Faith,” “The word of the truth of the Gospel.” But elasticity better suits creed-makers, as the purpose of all creeds is to exclude certain ideas, and yet retain sufficient elasticity to include all those desired.

Whatever amount of truth Dr. Thomas “finally developed,” he always maintained this distinction. Even so late as May, 1860, he clearly expressed it thus: - “The thing to be believed in order to salvation is not an isolated fact but a great whole - the truth;’ and not the truth abstractly: but the truth concretely, ‘as it is in Jesus. In general terms this is styled ‘the Gospel of the Kingdom, of the Deity;’ which signifies the good news concerning the Kingdom to be set up by the Deity of the Heavens.” Dan. ii. 44 - Herald of Kingdom, vol. x, p. 104.

In November, 1860, the Doctor writes regarding an anticipated split in Illinois: - “The Herald is the organ only of the simplicity that is in Christ. Let all then who are not for this, lift up their banner against it openly, that the real friends of the Gospel of the Kingdom may see clearly who are for the unadulterated milk of the word and who for that word made of none effect by crotcheterian traditions.”-

“A split! - There will be no ‘split’ among those who love the truth in its simplicity. Men and women, bound by this, can never be dissevered; and all who do not believe it purely and simply, the sooner they declare themselves the better for the faithful. We go in for quality, not for quantity of brethren. A few brave hearts who understand, love, and practise the simplicity that is in Christ, are more desirable and efficient than a multitude who have a name to live while really dead in trespasses and sins.

Our enterprise is not a pecuniary speculation, therefore numbers for lucrous purposes are not our aim. Our enterprise is to develop the truth formatively, that the truth, as the incorruptible seed of God, may generate such a people for the Lord as He will not be ashamed of at His appearing. Our platform is this, and upon it there is no room for the old Adam and his traditions . . .

“Will not allow anyone to act a new idea beyond himself! This is another entertaining item of news! But how are we invested with such power as this? Have we such power over men’s brains that they cannot get out new ideas without our leave? And if they perchance slip out in the east or west, is there no paper in Illinois, or elsewhere, on the qui vive to publish them? Does the friend who utters this expect us to endorse what we believe to be unscriptural because the would-be Neo-idealists are in love with their own novelties? Publish them as wide as you please, but do not mix them up with the Gospel, or every true friend of the Gospel will feel bound to circumscribe your influence within the smallest possible domain.” - Herald of Kingdom vol. x., p. 208.

The Doctor here declares - “Our platform is this.” This reminds me of R. Roberts’s committal to Dr. Thomas, in which he says, concerning the whole truth as brought to light by Dr. Thomas - “This is our platform.” “There is but one safe position, and in that we mean, by the favour of God, to entrench ourselves for better or for worse, viz., the whole truth as brought to light by Dr. Thomas. A brick displaced loosens the building. We understand the structure of the edifice. We yield not a slavish deference to the judgment of Dr. Thomas; but we rejoice to be able to see that by the grace of God he exhumed for us the whole truth; and for this we shall stand till death, or the Lord’s coming” end the fight. This is our ‘platform.’ Here we shall be found or not at all,” - Christadelphian, Dec., 1873.

Here are two platforms - the one based on “the simplicity that is in Christ,” (carefully distinguished from secondary truths) on the behalf of which he was baptised in 1846 – the other based on “the whole truth as brought to light by Dr. Thomas,” during his post-baptismal career down to his decease in 1871, a period of about twenty-five years. The unreasonableness of R. Roberts appears in claiming Dr. Thomas as the patron of a creed of thirty-five articles, merely because he developed certain opinions on certain scriptural subjects which R. Roberts thought fit to incorporate into the “One Faith,” without either the authority of scripture or the example of Dr. Thomas. The “One Faith,” as brought to light by Dr. Thomas, is the true question, if any needs to be raised.

But the question arises here – did Dr. Thomas maintain this position regarding “the simplicity that is in Christ” to the end? I unhesitatingly answer, Yes, he did. First, I have no evidence that Dr. Thomas ever

renounced his baptism which took place in 1846. Second, his later utterances were all in exact conformity with those I have quoted. I shall quote a few. Thus in Dec., 1866: -

“But some may be prompted to inquire, Is it necessary to understand all the details of Resurrection and Judgment to possess the faith which justifies? In reply, I would say, if it were necessary, there would scarcely be found in this generation a corporal’s guard of justified believers. I apprehend that, if a person heartily believe in ‘the resurrection of the just and the unjust,’ and that both these classes will appear in the presence of the Righteous Judge, ‘to give account of themselves to him,’ their understanding, so far, is sound upon these two first principles; but, if on the contrary, he deny the resurrection of ‘the unjust,’ or saints of the Sardean type, and repudiates the citation of the righteous to judgment, saying that there is no other judgment for them than what they are subjected to in the present state, I can only say for myself that I had rather never have been born than to appear in the Divine Presence with such a tradition. It would not be difficult to make out against such a case of constructive treason to the truth. But this is neither my purpose nor desire. ‘Judge nothing,’ says Paul, ‘before the time until the Lord come, who will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the heart.’ My purpose is to enlighten not to condemn. The more we understand of what we profess to believe, the stronger is our faith therein; and the nearer we approach its development the more necessary is it that a lively interest be kindled in us that our lamps be well trimmed, and our lights be found brightly burning.” - Preface to Anastasis.

The Doctor is here professedly speaking of resurrection and judgment in relation to justifying faith, and simply contends for hearty belief in “the resurrection of the just and the unjust,” and that both these classes will appear in the presence of the Righteous Judge to give account of themselves to Him” without mentioning simultaneous appearing. I do not know any among the so-called Dowieites who are not in accord with this position; or who deny the resurrection of the unjust and repudiate the citation of the righteous to judgment.

Again, in August, 1869: - “I would propose that all your readers consent to stop disputing about the nature and pre-existence of Christ for the next twelve months, and apply themselves to the study of the subject as revealed in Moses and the prophets, and by Jesus, John, Peter, and Paul, in the spirit of little children. There is too much cacoethes scribendi et loquandi by the ‘unlearned and the unstable’ for the interests of the truth and themselves. They wrest the scriptures to their own destruction, and develop by their loquacity only that which is altogether evil and embarrassing. If they would be more zealous for the enlightenment of their neighbours in the first principles of the Gospel, and less captious and disputatious among themselves, I am sure that they would lay up for themselves in store a better foundation against the time to come, and be more likely to lay hold on eternal life.” - Christadelphian, August, 1869, p. 216.

Here the Doctor clearly distinguishes between “the nature and pre-existence of Christ” and the “first principles of the Gospel, and thus places the former in the list of secondary questions, which may be left undecided for twelve months without jeopardising the faith of the gospel.

In February, 1871, only eight days before his decease, in an article he was obliged to leave unfinished, entitled “What is flesh?” he says: - “I would suggest, that discussion of the very knotty and intricate subject of the *quo modo* of the manifestation of Deity in flesh be suspended among you till each member of the ecclesia be furnished with a copy of my forthcoming Pictorial Illustration and Explanatory Key. In the meantime, it may not be amiss for our metaphysical friends to see if they can agree among themselves with regard to the more simple, proximate and primary question, What is flesh? before they undertake to speculate dogmatically concerning the manifestation of Deity in flesh who is spirit. You will excuse me, perhaps just reminding you here that metaphysics are of a very unsubstantial, and shadowy nature. As a system, a science so-called, that treats of things immaterial, and therefore intangible, ethereal, or visionary; and which may be considered quite beyond the sphere of all profitable inquiry by plain unphilosophical men, whose faith is based upon the revealed testimony of God, and not upon the *modus in quo* or manner in which essences are generated; and how entities and quiddities are induced. We can believe the testimony of John, that Deity can of stones raise up children to Abraham, with a true and valid faith, which is not at all impaired by our metaphysical inability to explain the process by which He is able to arrive at such a result; for the faith which saves men is the belief of testimony divinely given, not a metaphysical or scientific comprehension of processes. Metaphysics are capital things for doubtful disputation, and admirably adapted to the development of sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. Let our friends, therefore, who would grow in the knowledge of God and in his favour, eschew metaphysics, by which they can be neither enlightened nor improved.” - Christadelphian, April, 1871, p. 106

Observe, Dr. Thomas here reiterated in different terms the advice he gave eighteen months before, already quoted, to “stop disputing” about the nature and pre-existence of Christ, namely, “the *quo modo* of the manifestation of Deity in flesh,” and terms it “a very knotty and intricate subject.” Moreover, he

maintains the distinction between "A TRUE AND VALID FAITH" and "DOGMATIC SPECULATION," and declares that "THE FAITH WHICH SAVES MEN IS THE BELIEF OF TESTIMONY DIVINELY GIVEN, NOT A METAPHYSICAL OR SCIENTIFIC COMPREHENSION OF PROCESSES." This is not only what Dr. Thomas "finally developed" on the subject, but it is what he maintained in 1848, and all through his remarkable career. And I hesitate not to say that this is what I have for many years been committed to, and it might, if necessary, be shewn to be a correct definition of what has been termed Dowieism.

But why, it may be asked, be at such pains to ascertain the mind of Dr. Thomas, or other any man, on the "One Faith" and its relation to human creeds? Not because we regard him as an authority in the matter, or that we have ever been "committed" to him in any way; but simply and solely because it has been sought to make ecclesiastical capital out of his name, and that by misrepresenting his true sentiments? And even taking R. Roberts's "committal" to Dr. Thomas, as since explained away, to signify mere agreement in faith and opinion, why should he imitate the Corinthians in saying, "I am of Paul," etc., so strongly condemned by the apostle? This is far from honouring the memory of Dr. Thomas, who would have been but too ready to repudiate such fulsome adulation. What is, and ever shall be most to the honour of Dr. Thomas is not what he developed regarding the nature of Christ, or of Satan, or of the order and manner of resurrection and judgment, etc.; but his bringing to light, and earnestly contending for "the gospel of the Kingdom" and "name of Jesus Christ," as the faith once delivered to the saints, and its position as an indispensable antecedent to baptism in order to justification, and (as long as he was able to wield the pen) his persistent discrimination between the Faith and all else besides, however true and Scriptural in his estimation.

This conspicuous feature of the Doctor's labours has always been frankly acknowledged, even by the so-called Dowieties, of which, did space permit, I could easily furnish proof.

I humbly submit, that the charge against the brotherhood of being for sixteen years on "a crude and partial basis" is entirely disproved by what I have advanced. It seems to be assumed by R. Roberts that crudeness applies only to what is made up of few parts, but it would not be difficult to shew that it is a prominent characteristic of the Birmingham creed. It is strange that the history of the last eighteen months, not to speak of the last eighteen hundred years, has not taught R. Roberts that the very constitution of human nature is incompatible with the existence of any community upon a theological basis in which fallible human reason is so necessary an element; and especially where a human infallible head is not acknowledged. Even Popery itself failed to preserve unity from this very cause. And what does it all come to? Dis-affection, heart-burnings, alienation, and estrangement, both religious and social, among those who are really one in faith, and ought to be one in mind and heart. And how fertile a source of indifference and indecision even among those growing up among us, whose minds are often too easily distracted by the hair-splitting distinctions that are contended for among first principles. Is it not too easily forgotten that all have not the same power to appreciate infinitesimal differences and to follow fine-spun arguments, which can be so easily raised by those who have the faculty of abstract reasoning well developed? I trust it will be admitted that these remarks have a bearing on the whole brotherhood of whatever name, to each and all of whom they are respectfully submitted for their careful and prayerful consideration.

Edinburgh. J. CAMERON.

This article ought to be the means of doing much good. - ED.

ABERGAVENNY is only a small place of about six thousand inhabitants. It is not a very fair field for the growth of "the truth." But we have not been idle. Railway officers, among whom my lot is cast, work, as a rule, at high pressure and long hours, and this seems to make them callous and indifferent to ordinary matters of life. As to Scripture, or anything of that kind, they would have to be transported to some quiet spot, and undergo a course of exorcising to drive out the whistle and rattle of trains, and the click of the telegraph, before the Gospel could have the slightest chance of entrance into their muddled brains. I have distributed many books and tracts, and still hope to create interest in a few. - WM. BEDDOES.

BIRMINGHAM. - THE LAMP. - I am much pleased with the general appearance of the Lamp in its new form. The double columns are, in my opinion, a decided improvement; the type is excellent, the matter, on the whole, is very good. Allow me to congratulate you upon the successful completion of Vol. I., and the beginning of Vol. II., under such favourable circumstances. The Lamp has burned satisfactorily during the first year of its probation, and has proved itself a good light to the path of the brethren. Some would have it the Lamp was a sort of "Will-o'-the-wisp," which had arisen in order to dance about, and "dazzle," and "bewitch," and allure "the spiritually minded into the marshes of heresy," and then disappear; leaving them in a delightful state of muddle. I am glad that such have been disappointed. The

Lamp has burned steadily, and with fixed light, and has survived the boisterous wind, which for twelve months has tried, and been unable to extinguish it. As to the effect which the Lamp has had upon the truly spiritually minded, I can only say it has been for their good. Its appearance has aroused a spirit of inquiry and independence of thought, and has served as a warning to the brethren against the danger they were in of getting as bigoted and narrow-minded as those whom they were in the habit of condemning for bigotry. – JAMES FLINT.

DEAR Bro. Turney, - It is with pleasure I inform you that we have raised the standard of the Truth in our new place - the Assembly Rooms, Constitution-hill (as mentioned in our last), and, with renewed energies, are labouring in the work of the Lord, having confidence that he will bless the earnest efforts we are putting forth in the name of the Lord Jesus. I have to report that two applications have been made for immersion - Elizabeth Webb Turner and Emily Jones, the daughters of Brethren H. Turner and P. S. Jones. The candidates upon examination, proved to be very intelligent in their belief of the things necessary for salvation; to our gratification, and to the honour and comfort of their parents, who have led them into the way of life. Their immersion will take place at the end of the week. The following were the last four lectures delivered in Broad Street Rooms - November 8th, "The popular Doctrine of the Devil and Hell, unscriptural," H. Turney. November 15th, "Trinitarianism and Unitarianism versus the Bible," F. N. Turney. November 22nd, "The Fall; is The Almighty the Author of Sin?" W. Ellis. November 29th, "Where will the righteous have eternal life – earth or heaven?" H. Turner. I may say that the Brethren are in unity and love, zealously supporting our present undertaking for the spread of the Truth, and already see that we shall be able to awaken the interest of the public in that part of the town. Bro. James Martin is here, lending a helping hand to aid the truth's progress. We pray the Father to send more labourers into the vineyard, that the fruit may be gathered.

- CHARLES JENNINGS.

A NEW CREED.

Dear Brother Martin, - I take the liberty of writing you a few lines by way of explanation of some statements of mine, which appear to you so rash and unwarranted. In the first place, you are surprised that I should say that men are "not condemned." But I say this with a due regard to the meaning of the terms I employ. It is clear to me that it would be gross injustice to condemn anyone unless for actual sin; and that the condemnation is really for actual sin, I know from the words of Jesus, who says distinctly that "this is the condemnation that light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." (Jno. iii. 19). However, inasmuch as it is true that we inherit the consequences of the sentence of condemnation passed upon Adam for his actual sin, I do not deny the propriety of your speaking of us as being "condemned in Adam," provided you recognise the fact that this condemnation does not imply that we are in any way guilty or deserving of punishment. It is true that by birth we are without God, and without hope in the world, but I think we should not forget that we may be all this, and yet perfectly guiltless, and consequently, perfectly independent of the necessity of any one suffering for us in the sense of anyone paying the penalty of our condemnation. This point is so very important that I should like to illustrate it by the following: - Once upon a time, when Scotland was a separate kingdom, a certain rich young merchant and his wife were discovered giving shelter to an English spy. Such an offence was generally punished with instant death, but in this case, owing to the esteem in which the parties had previously been held, more leniency was shown, the sentence being forfeiture of all their goods, and perpetual banishment to a solitary and almost uninhabited island, away from the main land. Here the couple passed the remainder of their lives, amidst much privation and suffering. They had several children, who were trained to eke out a subsistence by hunting and fishing, but it was a very sorry subsistence they could get in such a place after all, though of course they did not feel their privations so much, never having experienced anything better. Still, it was often remarked by their neighbours what a different kind of life they would have been born to but for the unfortunate errors of their parents. Now, Bro. Martin, what I would like you to notice is this, that the sons and daughters of this banished merchant, had nothing whatever to do with the sheltering of the spy: that they were not under the sentence passed upon their father and mother, and yet were suffering the same as their parents. The application of this is easy. We had nothing to do with the sin of our first parents; we are not guilty by it; we have no right to be condemned for it, and what is more, I rejoice to know that we are not condemned for it. Here we have been differing. You think that, because of Adam's sin we are "condemned;" that we are "in prison;" that we are "in debt." You think that the debt is our lives, and that Jesus had to pay the debt for us, so that God might do away with His sentence, and let us go free. You say this, and are far from being alone in saying it, but for my part, I have no doubt it is a mistake, founded at least partly on the orthodox notion of children having "Original Sin," (!) which you, having given up the idea of "sin in the flesh," should be the last to harbour. I have already made this letter longer than I expected, so I will not say much more, but I

think a fair consideration of the principles herein stated are enough to show that the kind of atonement you contend for cannot be correct. Of course I admit that there are many words and phrases in the New Testament, (such as ransom, redeem, bought, etc.) which seem to favour your view, but I think they are capable of easy explanation on a theory which is not so unjust as to require the innocent to suffer in the room, and stead of the guilty. Meantime, however, all I have tried and require to do is to show that (1) a child should not be considered guilty because of the sin of its father, and (2) if not guilty, should not be punished for guilt, nor be under the necessity of having another to suffer in place of it. – Yours sincerely,
JAMES MEWHORT.

THE REPLY. - Dear Brother, - I am glad you have thought well to furnish me with what may be termed a confession of your faith, and as you have given your consent for its publication, it shows that you are anxious for others to read and adopt your new creed. I call it new, because, so far as I am aware, no Christadelphian (except a few at Liverpool) have taken the Socinian view of the human race; and I am inclined to think that nothing but the present controversy would have caused any brethren to take up the Unitarian side of the question. Therefore, I regard your present position as the outcome of the extremity into which the doctrines advocated in the Christadelphian Lamp have driven many who, like yourself, cannot consent to the wholesome words of Scripture. It would be far more pleasant for me to hear that you were rejoicing in the Lord, as the result of understanding the whole truth, than to hear that you are rejoicing that men are not condemned. This would be a fact, if you confine the word "men" to the Christ and His brethren, but using it as you do to express the human race in their natural condition you, like thousands of others, are rejoicing in a delusion; therefore, I am unable to reciprocate your joy. By your Unitarian notions, you free the Christ from condemnation. But what is the use of it! Other men, you say, were as free as He was; hence no difference existed. You claim Christ as a witness in your favour, by quoting John iii. 19, "This is the condemnation that light is come into the world," etc. Now, I believe Christ was "the Light of the World;" but, I also believe that before He actually appeared, Light was in the world; this is to say, light was diffused by the Angels in the Garden of Eden, and every word of God was "Light," which was spoken of Him by the prophets to the fathers; and that this "Light," as well as that which shone through his own Son (Heb. i. 1) made men accountable beings, and made known the fact that they were born sinners; for, by the law, is the knowledge of sin, hence the Saviour's statement, "If I had not come, ye would have had no sin (to answer for), but since I have come, your sin remaineth." This is the condemnation spoken of by Christ in your quotation. Adam loved darkness rather than light, which is proved by his evil deeds, and as he sinned against "light" and knowledge he, as the head constituted all his descendants sinners, (Rom. v 12 see margin); and for this sin, the race must have returned to, and remained in the dust, had it not been for the merciful and gracious intervention of Jehovah. Imputed sin is punished by one death, which is described by Paul as perishing "without law," (Rom. ii. 12), while actual sin will be punished by two deaths, the latter called the "Second death" (Rev. xx. 14). The final result, however, in each case is the same. Federal sinners are "know-nothings," such as heathens, idiots, and babies, and are therefore by far the largest class. Actual sinners are confined to such as know the joyful sound of God's glad-tidings, and do not obey the requirements thereof. Jesus was neither a "Federal sinner," nor an actual one; he was, therefore, not condemned in Adam, or for His own offences. For He was separated from sinners completely, by being the Son of God, and, therefore, not the son of a sinner; and consequently able to redeem, not only those "who are under the law," but Gentiles also. Therefore, Jesus was what God made Him, and we are what Adam made us. The fact that the world was sold under sin, and in a state of estrangement from God, shows that it required redeeming. Now, that this doctrine of Federal Sin is Scriptural is evident from several points of view: first, Eve was not formed at the time the command went forth - "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shall surely die." Therefore, the tree was not forbidden to Eve, but only to Adam, consequently, whatever she knew of the mind of the Elohim, she acquired in a second-hand way from her husband. This knowledge, according to Paul, made her an actual transgressor, for he says, "The woman was first in the transgression," yet, notwithstanding this, the only person on whom the divine condemnation of death was formerly passed, was Adam. It was not said to the woman, "To dust shalt thou return, but that the woman was included, is proved by two facts. First, she, like her husband, died in due course; the second, she was a part of Adam at the time he was placed under the Edenic law. That this sentence on Adam means a sentence on the world Paul has proved by his well-known statement, "In Adam all die," and such is the case, young or old, whether they sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression, or not. The personal pronoun "Thou" must be applied to Adam's race, not simply to Adam individually, therefore, your illustration, while admirably suitable to your view of the matter, is quite unsuitable to illustrate the real position of the sons of Adam. The "disobedience of one man" caused their banishment, "far away from the main land," and the only "way" back is through

Jesus the Christ, our Passover. But, according to you, we are perfectly independent of such help, although you strangely enough state that we are “by birth, without God, and without hope,” and that we “inherit the consequences of Adam’s sin.” If this be not a position of banishment and condemnation, I am at a loss to know what it is. By your letter you place yourself in the unenviable position of correcting the sacred writers. Jesus evidently regarded Adam’s race in a state of death while they lived. His statement is (Matt. viii. 22), “Let the dead bury their dead.” Here physical and legal death is spoken of in the most explicit manner, and that by an authority which you should be the last man to question. Paul also diametrically opposes your theory by his statement (Rom. v. 12), “By one man sin entered into the world * * * and so death passed upon all men.” So that the Adamic race are guilty in the “federal” sense, not otherwise, but the result is precisely the same as though they had actually sinned. It is therefore quite Scriptural to regard Adam’s sons as “sick and in prison,” “in debt,” requiring a physician to heal and release them; and if Jesus was a son of Adam, He was unquestionably in this pitiable position, and unfit to help Himself or us out of it. You have a sort of holy horror of the word “substitution.” If the word “representative” is less offensive to you it will answer the purpose as well, for as words they have the same meaning. But as you have simply raised an alarm, and not explained your views of reconciliation, I am unable to form an opinion as to what you think. If the words “ransom,” “redeem,” “bought,” etc., are capable of an “easy explanation,” it would have been well if in your letter you had explained their meaning, so that I might have known the “justice” of your scheme of atonement, as opposed to the scheme I and others affirm to be Scriptural. So far as I can see of your present views, you are fighting against God. If your scheme is right then God’s is wrong. I cannot now enter into a long explanation of the Bible doctrine of substitution, but it seems to me that Paul’s expression, “He died, the just for the unjust, to bring us to God,” covers the whole ground. Peter’s idea of redemption coincides with that of his brother Paul. He says (1 Peter i. 18-19), “For ye (the saints) know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish and without spot,” and to the efficacy of this blood the saints ascribe their redemption in the “new song” recorded in the Rev. v. 9. From these and kindred statements it is evident that, apart from the shedding of Christ’s blood, death must have for ever held us in its grasp, and thus Christ died instead of us, and He was able to do this because He was born free from the Adamic law of death, and being thus “free” at the start, His righteous life made it impossible for Him to be “holden of death,” hence his resurrection. Had He been a son of Adam, His righteousness would not have been accounted anything, but being free-born, and remaining free through His probationary career, He was able to be our emancipator, by becoming our representative or “substitute” (read carefully Rom. v.). You admitted to me that Christ must have been a substitute for God, according to your reading of Heb. ix. 16-17. Which is most “unjust,” for Christ to suffer for the “innocent” or for the “guilty?” God was innocent, yet you say Jesus who was also innocent, suffered as a substitute. Men are “guilty,” yet you repudiate as unjust the numerous Bible statements that Christ died for them. He not only sealed the covenant with His blood, but he put away sin “by the sacrifice of Himself, and thus God is just, and the justifier of him that believeth. The words “mercy” and “grace,” like “ransom” and “redeem” will have to find an “easy explanation” at your hands before your new creed can flourish among such as take the Bible, and the “Bible only” for their rule of faith. Read the prophecy of Caiaphas (John xi. 49-53.) respecting the object of the death of Christ. He calls men “know-nothings” who did not regard it expedient that one man should die to save the whole nation from perishing, and not that nation only, but all who should believe on His name. In conclusion, let me say I much regret the diversity of opinion among Christadelphians, who used to boast of believing and teaching no more and no less than that which is written in the sacred pages, and, as a consequence, all speaking the same thing. But those days have passed away, and the sectarian notion crept in which is anything, everything, or nothing, so long as the cause flourishes. This state of things is amply illustrated by the fact that you, with your present views, are welcome at the Temperance Hall. I shall continue to believe in this sectarian laxity among the so-called Christadelphians until you either change your present views, or cease to meet with Bro. Smith and Co., or vice-versa. Wishing you and all the brethren more light upon the glorious scheme of salvation recorded nowhere else but in the Bible, I remain, yours faithfully, JAMES MARTIN. To James Mewhort, Edinburgh.

DAWLEY. The people look upon me as their enemy now, because I tell them the truth. This district swarms with Ranters, Methodists, Quakers, and Baptists. They shun me as they would a leper, and strictly charge their members to keep out of my company. They say I am worse than an infidel; but thank the Lord, I know the truth, and the truth has made me free, and I now rejoice in the hope of life to come. May the Lord bless and prosper you every good word and work, so that when the Chief Shepherd shall appear you may receive a crown of glory, that fadeth not away. - G. B. FOLLOWS.

GLASGOW. - We have taken a Hall in a central part of the city, viz., 126 Renfield Street. The first meeting was held on Sunday, Nov. 1st, when one of the Sisters Spence, of Kilbarchan was present. The

distance of 12 miles between Kilbarchan and Glasgow renders the attendance of brethren from that place impossible, except at long intervals. Our new Hall is well lighted, and has a good approach. We have also the use of an ante-room for the breaking of bread, as at present, our numbers are small, viz., nine persons. But we are not discouraged as this is not the first time we have been placed at a disadvantage. We have one applicant for baptism; a young man who has been interested about a year. Several strangers have attended our evening meetings. The young man from George Street, who was to prove to me that Christ suffered for His own sins, has not yet put in an appearance. On behalf of the Brethren, I wish to say that James Gray's conduct is not such as those professing godliness can approve, and any demand he may make has nothing to do with us. I believe he is in Dundee or Aberdeen. - JOHN O'NEIL.

Brother J. O'Neil announces the immersion, on the 22nd of November, of Mr. James Robinson, aged 28, formerly a member of the Church of England. Brother Robinson was led to inquire into the things of the Kingdom and Name about a year ago by acquaintance with Bro. Noble Watson. Bro. R. Russell, of Coatbridge, had attended the meeting and spoken to the brethren to edification. Some interest is being created by the circulation of the Lamp. One person to whom Brother O'Neil had lent it said that it had given him a more satisfactory view of the Christ than he previously held.

IPSWICH. - I herewith enclose P.O.O. subscription for the Lamp, and shall feel obliged if you will forward it to me, commencing with 1875. I have been taking the Christadelphian the past year; but, having seen the Lamp I prefer it by far to the other, and also think the views held by YOU "Renunciators," as you are called infinitely nearer the Truth than those presented in the Christadelphian. - G. H. HANSON.

JARROW AND NEWCASTLE. - Dear Brother, I apprised you in my last of the fact that the brethren at Newcastle had arranged for some lectures to the public. I have to state that they came off as arranged, the meeting-place being well filled on each occasion; the results we must leave to "our Father who is in heaven." Brother Davidson, of Jarrow, invited me to deliver a course of lectures to his friends and neighbours; the interest awakened in Jarrow was even greater than in Newcastle. Reports of our sayings and doings were reported and freely commented upon in the news-papers. Bro. Davidson is a man who likes to begin at the beginning of a subject, and in order to fully understand your position in the Christ question he wished me to send him the Lamp, from the commencement, but knowing that you had sold off all the first, I did not write to you. Should you be able to procure them for him you may send them on and he will remit you. There is plenty of smoke and plenty of business, and plenty of preaching in this neighbourhood, but very little truth. However, I am glad to say that there are a few brethren of the right sort, and a considerable number who are enquiring into the way of life. As Newcastle is on the way to Scotland, and as brethren bound thither "must needs go through," I would recommend it as a place for rest and labour. Much good might be done, and the "little flock" would be cheered and refreshed by the call. - Yours faithfully, JAMES MARTIN.

LEICESTER. - Dear Brother Turney, The interest in the lectures given in the Temperance Hall continues unabated. Several are making considerable advance towards arriving at a "Knowledge of the Truth," and are expected shortly to render the obedience which alone will bring them into the sure ark of refuge. Brother Handley has been spending some time here, and has lectured twice during the month, besides taking part in the week night discussions; these continue to be very interesting and well attended. It is proposed to hold a tea meeting on the Saturday after Christmas Day, to which as many brethren and sisters from other ecclesias as can make it convenient will be welcome. Any who can do so will please address a line to Brother Weale, 12, Horsefair Street, Leicester, to enable provision to be made accordingly. - CHAS. WEALE.

LONDON. - Bro. Nichols reports the baptism of Mr. Wm. Amos Worskett, who has been brought to the understanding of the Truth through the labours of Bro. Handley. It was expected that before the publication of this good news two more persons would have placed themselves in the same desirable relationship to Christ. On Sunday, December 13th, the brethren held a tea meeting at which were present Brother and Sister Lewin, from Nottingham. The time was enjoyably and profitably spent in conversing upon various scripture topics.

MANCHESTER. - At the request of the Brethren I invite you (Brother Swindel, of Halifax,) to lecture for us at the opening of our new Meeting Room. A kind of Creed has lately been issued from London, and this was very hastily presented to the ecclesia and hastily accepted, though only by a part of the body. The only portion brought under the notice of the brethren: was paragraph ix. which runs as follows: - "He (Jesus) inherited the consequence of Adam's sin, including the sentence of death." One consequence of the adoption of this article was the retirement of Brethren Teasdale and Artingstall. They were cut off by a brother declaring that he would fellowship none who differed from this decree. On the 23rd August I was lecturing, and stated that Jesus was born heir to eternal life, that He stood in similar position to Adam

before he transgressed; that it was necessary He should pass through a trial. Afterwards some said if I had been trying to preach Turney's doctrine, I could not have succeeded better. A meeting was called, and it was resolved that the secretary should write to me demanding my signature to the London Creed. This I refused. At the following meeting I told the brethren that their action in this matter was not scriptural. I was unable to find a single text to prove that Jesus inherited the sentence of death; but I found many giving the idea of His bearing the penalty due to us for sin, and I advised the alteration of article ix. to that effect. I likewise challenged discussion on the matter, but no one accepted it. The consequence of trying to thrust this London Creed on the church is that seven have withdrawn. I desired the meeting to go through the question with me and put me right, but they declined. Bro. Teasdale and I took the new room, and invited the Manchester and all brethren to hear a lecture, after which Brother Birkinhead or any other to be allowed to question me on what, I had advanced. Brother Birkinhead declined, on the ground that he was not supported by the church. Brother Shuttleworth, of Keighley, put some questions. The meeting was adjourned for a week. In the meantime I proposed a discussion with Brother S. on the following topic, "Do the Scriptures teach that the belief that Jesus inherited the consequences of Adam's sin, including sentence of death, is essential to fellowship and salvation?" Brother S. affirmed; I. denied. A more feeble defence of a pet theory I never listened to, and no wonder, seeing there is no testimony to sustain it. This affair terminated our connexion with the Manchester ecclesia. We now feel it incumbent on us to do something to promote the interest of the truth, and shall be very glad of your assistance. - Wm. Carr.

[We congratulate this little band upon their independence, and the step they have taken under the circumstances narrated. Here we see the baneful effects of domineering obstinacy, and paltry creed-making and creed-mending. Here also we behold another example of that grievous lack of forbearance and willingness to instruct and exhort. "Defence," indeed! How can there be any defence where there is no testimony to prove? We rejoice that so many more see and declare that the Redeemer was no slave, but a free Man. And our counsel is "study to be quiet."] - EDITOR.

MALDON. - Brother C. Handley is glad to inform us that they have an applicant for baptism, and that several other persons are manifesting considerable interest in the gospel of the kingdom of God. The meetings continue as usual.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE. - Having had twelve months to consider the subject of the Christ, brought forward by yourself in the "Christadelphian Lamp" we have, as an Ecclesia in Newcastle, come to the conclusion that what you have said, and said so well, on the subject is in harmony with the Scriptures. I therefore very gladly hand my name in as a regular subscriber; and for payment of this year's issue, I herewith enclose P.O.O., 6s. We have been very agreeably surprised by a visit from Brother and Sister Martin. Bro. M. has been the means of assisting us in comprehending in a clearer light, the scripturalness of an uncondemned Christ, not that ever we believed in a condemned Christ, therefore the teaching of Brother Roberts was the new doctrine to us. Our business was to decide between your teaching and his with the Scriptures in hand. We have done so with the above mentioned result. Brother Martin has been instrumental in enlightening us upon various passages of the word concerning the Christ as a ransom and deliverer from Adamic sentence, for which we are truly thankful. We found him to be a laborious, patient, and willing instructor, and are sorry to part with him. He delivered three lectures to the public, the hall being well filled on each occasion. The following is the bill: - "What is truth? Antipas, F.D. editor of "The Old Sun Dial," will lecture as follows, in the Mechanics' Hall, New Bridge Street, Newcastle, when he will endeavour to answer the above important question in the following order - On Monday evening, November 16, 1874, first, that it is Scriptural Truth that Christ is coming- a second time to the earth to reign as King! On Wednesday evening, November 18th, he will answer the question, where are the dead? By showing, from the Scriptures, that they are not singing in Heaven or writhing in Hell, but asleep in their graves, and will remain there until the Resurrection! On Friday evening, November 20th, Heaven to come to men: Men not to go to Heaven, or the earth to be the everlasting possession and dwelling place of the righteous, and therefore not to be burned up. Chair taken at 8 each evening, by Mr. J. Scott, of Newcastle. We hope Brother M. will not pass by Newcastle, nor any of the Brethren who visit Scotland. This a good half-way house, and we believe it to be a good field for Gospel work.

A friend, deeply interested in the Truth, Mr. James Davison, builder, Bulman's Village, Newcastle, very generously paid the expenses of the three lectures by Brother Martin. There are many beside Mr. Davison in Newcastle and neighbourhood who "are not far from the Kingdom of God." We most fervently hope that they will soon see and obey the Truth as it is in Jesus. One friend who has been looking into the Truth (Mr. John Armstrong) applied for immersion. He was formerly a Roman Catholic, and after due examination has been assisted by Brother Martin to put on the name of Christ in the only appointed way, viz., by immersion. We are, therefore refreshed by an addition to the family, and hope that our new

Brother will with us be able to walk worthy of the vocation by which we have been graciously called. I need not say that Brother Armstrong fully sees that the Bible teaches that Christ was God's Son, and therefore free from sin and condemnation. We regret that so many of our late Brethren take a contrary view; and thereby darken one of the Glorious Truths of "The Name." However, the Gospel is still the Power of God for Salvation to all who believe it, and we are of those who believe that the Truth will, in the end, triumph. Wishing you God speed in the advocacy thereof. JNO. B. HEDLEY.

NOTTINGHAM. - There have been two additions by immersion since our last report. Hannah Towndrow, wife of Brother Towndrow, formerly Independent, and Eliza Manchester, aged 20, domestic servant, formerly among the Methodists, but not a member of that body. A course of five lectures have been delivered by Brother Turney on the following subjects, to very attentive and increasing audiences. November 15th: The promises of God and the false promises of "Ministers of the Gospel." - November 22nd. No sky Kingdom. The return of the Jews and the setting up of the Kingdom of God. - November 29th: Christ's promise of Eternal Life. A denial of Pagan Philosophy on the Soul. - December 6th: Hell Torments preached by "Ministers" proved false. The Hell of the Bible explained. - December 13th: What the Gospel is and how to obey it. The Sunday School recently established makes very satisfactory progress, the numbers of children attending increasing from week to week.

STOKE. - I am much pleased with the Lamp, especially the new style which I think a very great improvement. - J. W. MOORE.

SWANSEA. - Bro. H. Evans requests us to state that he shall be glad to see any brethren who may be passing that way.

WISHAW. - All the friends here are well. Our meetings on the first day of the week are going on quietly; but our numbers are much reduced, in consequence of six having gone out to New Zealand, and one brother to another district. At present we are ten. Your intention to exclude from the present volume of the Lamp certain matters of controversy which appeared last year, is an indication of true wisdom. Hoping that you and all the friends in Nottingham are living in the enjoyment of that peace which passeth understanding. - JOHN KAY.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

CALCUTTA. - A letter from Sister Chitty to Captain Brown, by whom the same was forwarded to us, contains the shocking intelligence that her husband, Bro. Gideon Chitty, who was a pilot, has been lost in a cyclone at sea. This is very sad news. Bro. Chitty had been married only a few weeks. We understand that the vessel he was on board of was dashed to pieces in a frightful gale, on the 15th Oct., as she was riding at anchor at the head of the Bay of Bengal, and that a Lascar, one of three who were picked up, saw Bro. Chitty clinging to a spar then there came a heavy sea, and washed him away, and he was seen no more.

THE PILOT OF "THE EASTERN STAR"

Gideon sleeps in his watery bed,
Along the Indian shore;
The sea-weeds wreath his manly head,
And funeral weeds his newly-wed ;
For her Bridegroom is no more.
O God, that made the sea and land,
With all that therein are;
Strengthen, with Thy mighty hand,
Her who weeps in a far-off land,
Bereft of her life's bright star.
And when the sea shall give up her dead
And death be robbed of his sting;
Then shall brave Gideon rise from the wave
At the shout of Him who is mighty to save
And Bride and Bridegroom the victory sing.

EDITOR.

HAMILTON - Brethren Howel Smith and Boulter have left here for London, England. Since my last our number has been increased by two immersions, the new converts are Samuel Mitchley, formerly Episcopalian, and George Chapman, a fervent Methodist. Bro. Chapman brings all his earnestness with him to the fresh cause, and we hope will make a working brother. One of those Brethren who held with the other party has joined himself to us; he - Bro. Polly - rejoices with us in the Son of Jehovah's right hand, believing Him not to have been under the universal sentence of death, but free from that curse, as it required Him to be who was our Ransom. Please add to your list of subscribers the names mentioned. - [We are obliged for the "roll of paper," which we have by us, and may find use for. - ED.]

JEFFERSONVILLE. - We have not received the March number of the Cry, referred to in your last. As to "definite time," we are of opinion that all that can be made out of the times of Daniel and John has been done long since by different writers, and they have proved incorrect. If a man prophesy that the Lord will come next year, and hold on doing so year after year, he is sure to be right in the end; but this is only guess-work. How many people during the last 40 years have turned away from the Scriptures just because a definite-timist was wrong? - About one thing there can be no mistake, namely, the signs. They all say the end is near. Let us observe them, and stand ready. - EDITOR.

RIVERSIDE. - Your efforts to vindicate the truth of the great plan of salvation, by a correct knowledge of Him who though made sin for us knew no sin, are duly appreciated. We believe your Lamp is reflecting the true light, and in it we greatly rejoice. We first read Roberts's paper, and wrote him a letter of commendation for his promptitude in assailing a false theory without knowing what "the new heresy" was, being misled by his way of representing it. But the Popish proceedings of Roberts - even using physical force to exclude the brethren who differed in their views from him - caused us to look afresh into the whole matter. The Handley letter then appeared very remarkable. I observed how silent Robert was about it; and on critically reading the Christadelphian, comparing it with the Lamp, the Thirty-two Questions, the Sacrifice of Christ, and the Discussion with Smith, I found that the editor of the Christadelphian was in the wrong. Send Lamp to my new address - R. J. JONES.

I am in receipt of your last number Vol. I, of the Lamp. Its introduction has been stormy; but it lives, in spite of our friends, with undiminished vigour. I trust it will continue on and shed its illuminating rays all through the Christadelphian world. Its success thus far is greatly owing to the fact that among us, here and abroad, are still found men of independent thought. Let us breathe freely, and value other men's researches. The open acknowledgment of their writings is one cause of our admiration of your periodical. Such frankness is commendable, and by no means detracts from your own ability, but rather enhances the value of your writings. Things are very dull over here; many brethren are suffering from the drought, the grass-hopper plague, and the stringency of the market. - R. C. BINGLEY

GOVERNMENT OF TEMPER. - Every human creature is sensible of the propensities to some infirmity of temper, which it should be his care to correct and subdue, particularly in the early period of life; else, when arrived at a maturity, he may relapse into those faults which were originally in his nature, and which will require to be diligently watched and kept under, through the whole course of life. Since nothing leads more directly to the breach of charity, and to the injury and molestation of our fellow-creatures, than the indulgence of an ill temper. - Dr. BLAIR.